



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08175504 7

MICROFTI MED

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XXVIII.
JULY—DECEMBER.

LONDON :
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 200, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1854.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

CONTENTS

No. LXXXV.

	PAGE
ART. I.—Concionalia. By the Rev. H. Thompson, M.A. Vicar of Chard	1
II.—1. Analysis of the Evidence given before a Select Committee of the House of Lords, and a Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed during the Session 1852, to inquire into the operation of the Act 3 and 4 Will. IV. cap. 85, for the better Government of Her Majesty's Indian Territories.	
2. Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords.	
&c. &c.	45
III.—Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria. By George Dennis	79
IV.—“The Kings of the East;” an Exposition of the Prophecies; determining, from Scripture and from History, the Power for whom the Mystical Euphrates is being dried up; with an Explana- tion of certain other Prophecies concerning the Restoration of Israel	110
NO. LXXXV.—N.S.	

	PAGE
ART. V.—Voltaire and his Times. By L. F. Bungener. Authorized Translation	171
VI.—1. Memoirs of the Wesley Family; collected from original Documents. By Adam Clarke, LL.D. F.A.S.	
2. An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies of London, &c. By Josiah Woodward, D.D.	
&c. &c.	195
VII.—Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the existing state of the Corporation of the City of London, and to collect information re- specting its Constitution, Order and Government, &c., together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Presented to the Houses of Parlia- ment by command of her Majesty	220
NOTICES OF BOOKS	258
TITLE-PAGE AND INDEX TO VOL. XXVII.	

CONTENTS

OF

No. LXXXVI.



	PAGE
ART. I.—History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V. By Henry Hart Milman, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's...	265
II.—The Life of Mrs. Sherwood. By S. Kelly	327
III.—1. A Letter to a Convocation Man, concerning the Rights, Powers and Privileges of that Body. 4to. 1697. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. William Fraser, B.C.L.	
2. The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods asserted, with particular respect to the Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm and Church of England, occasioned by a pamphlet entitled, 'A Letter to a Convoca- tion Man.' By William Wake, D.D.	
&c. &c.	369
IV.—1. Theologia Moralis S. Alphonsi de Ligorio, Funda- toris Congregationis SS. Redemptoris ac olim Episcopi S. Agathæ Gothorum. Editio novissima; curavit P. Mich. Heilig, Congr. SS. Redempt. Presbyter, et Professor Theol. Moralis.	
&c. &c.	401
NO. LXXXVI.—N.S.	

	PAGE
ART. V.—Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History, applied to Language and Religion. By Chevalier Bunsen.....	448
VI.—1. Census of Great Britain, 1851. Education. England and Wales. Report and Tables.	
2. Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education	461
NOTICES OF BOOKS	502

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1854.

ART. I. — *Concionalia.* By the Rev. H. THOMPSON, M.A.,
Vicar of Chard. London: Masters.

No long time ago, in examining a village church in one of the midland counties, the attention of a casual visitor was attracted by a paper in the Rector's pew, which somewhat resembled a placard. On investigation it was found to be a sermon, headed, *On the Vanity and Uncertainty of Human Life*, and labelled, 'in case of an accident.' If, by chance, the worthy Incumbent should happen to forget the discourse he intended to deliver, here was a safe reserve. Human life was sure always to be uncertain; moralists would always call it vain; the sermon, therefore, could never come *mal-à-propos*, and there it lay, bearing amusing witness to the character and value of—we will take the liberty of coining a word—English Homilology.

Of all stiff, unreal, stilted demonstrations of religion, probably the sermons of the last century were the most remarkable specimens; and, if perhaps nowhere to be found in their original pasteboard and brocade character, they are still formidable enough in the compositions of the school which denominates itself orthodox and moderate, and which is termed by others high-and-dry. The sermons which came from the pulpits of Potter and Lavington, of Cornwallis and North, were like the hoops and toques of the routs and of Ranelagh; an outrageous caricature of formality, that must have disgusted any century except the seventeenth. When Blair was held up by Johnson—a man in so many respects before his age—as the model of pulpit eloquence, when the dictum of the great doctor was, that his sermons were *more golden than gold*, what must have been the depth of the degradation to which church oratory had sunk! Wherever we turn it is the same thing. At the beginning of the century, Addison, a man of deep religious feeling, commends Sir Roger's plan for the instruction of the Worcestershire peasants. 'At the chaplain's first settling with me, I made him a

‘present of all the good sermons which have been printed in English, and only begged that every Sunday he would pronounce one of them in the pulpit. I could heartily wish,’ says the Spectator, ‘that some of our country clergy would follow this example; and instead of wasting their spirits in laborious compositions of their own, would endeavour after a handsome elocution and all those other talents that are proper to enforce what has been penned by greater masters. This would not only be more easy to themselves, but more edifying to the people.’ Imagine a country congregation, year after year, listening, open-mouthed, to the glittering wit of South, the polished prettinesses of Tillotson, the heavy learning of Stillingfleet, the profounder erudition of Lloyd: the same Sunday always producing the same sermon, whatever might be the circumstances of the hearers,—the priest never able to appeal to local events, home occurrences, anything, in short, that could touch and interest; the instructor turned into a sermon-machine, and the sermons so evolved as unintelligible as if they had been written in Latin. And this was at the beginning only of that age—our Church’s passage through the Valley of the Shadow of Death. Time went on; religion was in England almost, and in the Scotch Establishment entirely, eliminated from the pulpit. We find Clayton consulting Lady Suffolk—a Bishop taking advice from an adulteress—on the composition of a sermon. We may read—if we have patience—in every episcopal charge, the watchword that was afterwards Talleyrand’s, *surtout point de zèle*; we see Doctors of Divinity delivering with universal applause the same sermons which they had produced before an university audience, to criminals, condemned, and struggling, in the last agonies of their earthly existence, to make their peace with God. We find, as Wesleyanism developed the numerous resources of natural preaching, the laced coat of the ‘orthodox’ party stiffening into cast-iron, their somnolence morphinised into death. Persons, we believe, are now living, who can remember a curate hunted from a metropolitan pulpit because it was his custom to raise his eyes from his manuscript. Persons who have not long been dead, could recollect the discourse delivered by a dignitary in the parish church of S. Giles, and addressed to three classes,—the good, the bad, and the indifferent. The good were told that they needed no advice,—let them persevere in their righteousness, and the kingdom of heaven would be their reward; the bad—but in such a congregation (S. Giles’s!) it was uncharitable to suppose that such a class could be found; the indifferent lost much by not exerting a little more energy, in order that their reward might not only be rendered more certain, but more

brilliant. And this precious theology occupied in its enunciation exactly five minutes! But this was light and fervour in comparison with what we are told of the pulpit eloquence of the Scotch Establishment. James Haldane tells us that, in one of his missionary tours, he heard a minister solemnly warn his people against putting any trust, while they continued sinners, in the blood of Christ. 'Repent,' said he, 'become righteous, atone for your crimes by probity and virtue, and then, if you please, you may look to that blood, but not before.' Much about the same time Paley was assuring his hearers that the being born again meant nothing; 'nothing,' that is, 'to us, and in our circumstances.'

But it is not our intention to dwell on these miserable details of an age that has long since rendered an account of its spiritual neglect to God. Fearful must have been its reckoning for the souls that should not have died, and were nevertheless slain by its neglect. We turn to a more attractive subject; the sermons of those ages, the darkness of which excited the ridicule or the pity of the preachers of the last.

Mediæval ritual and mediæval architecture have, in some degree, received their meed of attention. Mediæval sermons have not yet found an historian. It will be our endeavour, in the following pages, not to enter into an essay on the subject, which would require a volume as immense as some of those of which it would treat; but to offer a few remarks on the practical bearing which the topic may assume as regards ourselves. We shall try to show, not what the preachers of the middle ages did, but some few things which we may learn from them to do or to avoid.

Leaving the consideration of such early treatises as that of S. Augustine, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, or such late ones as that of S. Charles Borromeo, *De Instructione Prædicatoris*, we may remark, that we have two mediæval Arts of Preaching. The one is the work of Guibert de Nogent, concerning the proper method of making a sermon. This learned Abbat, who died in 1124, gives us, however, little further information than this: that the preacher should exercise his talent as often as possible; should never mount the pulpit without prayer; should, above all things, be short, and should rather dwell on practical than dogmatical subjects. He notices that some, in his day, renounced preaching from the fear of vainglory, and the dread of being named *sermoners* and ventriloquists; a reproach which, it need not be added, is as old as the time of S. Gregory Nazianzen. The other is the treatise by Humbert¹ de Romanis, General of the Order of S. Dominic, in the second book of his work

¹ It is in the twenty-fifth volume of the Lyons *Bibliotheca Maxima*.

entitled, *De Institutione religiosorum Prædicatorum*, where he professes to teach 'a way of promptly producing a sermon for any set of men, and for all variety of circumstances.'

In looking at the immense mass of mediæval sermons, it is necessary that those who would not become absolutely bewildered, should keep steadily in view certain points which are not usually expressed in the headings of those compositions. As for example: whether what we now have be the sermon as the author intended it to be read, or the sermon notes from which he actually delivered it; whether it were taken down by one of his auditors from extemporaneous delivery, or written by himself; whether it were addressed to the clergy, to the people, or to monks; above all, whether it were written in Latin, or translated from the vernacular into that language. Let us give an example or two of each of these different characters. And first of cases in which the sermon, as we now have it, was manifestly extemporaneous.

No one can doubt that many of S. Augustine were so. Look at those on the Two Castings of the Net,¹ among the Paschal Homilies. One glance at these will convince the reader that they were taken down at the time by some diligent hearer, and afterwards either came into the possession of the Bishop, or were published by the affectionate zeal of some of his disciples. The conclusion of all differs no further than would naturally result from the involuntary variations of an extemporary preacher, intending, in different years, to say the same thing. Thus, in explaining the mystical signification of the 153 fishes, S. Augustine thus speaks in the first sermon:—

'This number signifies the thousand thousands of the saints and of the faithful. But why did the LORD vouchsafe to signify by these figures the many thousands who shall enter into the kingdom of heaven? Hear why. Ye know that the Law was given by Moses to the people of God; and that in that Law the Decalogue forms the chief part. . . . These ten precepts no man accomplishes by his own strength, unless he is helped by the grace of God. If therefore none can fulfil the law unless God assist with His Spirit, ye must remember that the Holy Ghost is set forth to us by the number seven. . . . Since, then, we need the Spirit to fulfil the Law, add seven to ten, and you have seventeen. Now, if you count from one to seventeen, you obtain one hundred and fifty-three. I need not count this up for you; count it for yourselves, and reckon thus: one and two and three and four make ten. In like manner add up the other numbers to seventeen, and you will have the holy number of the faithful and of the saints that shall be in heavenly places with the Lord.'

In the next sermon we have the same out-of-the-way thought in almost the same language:—

'As the Law is signified by the Decalogue, so the Holy Ghost is set forth as septiform. . . . Thus we get seventeen. The Law commands, the

¹ Ed. S. Maur. Ser. 249—253.

Spirit assists: the Law so acts upon thee that thou knowest thy duty: the Spirit, that thou dost it. Therefore let us keep on reckoning to seventeen, and we shall find ourselves at a hundred and fifty-three. You know how; I have often told you; I have often shown you. Two comes after one: two and one are three: three comes after two, which make six: four comes after three; there we have ten. Add the rest; and when you get up to seventeen you will also have arrived at a hundred and fifty-three.

In the third sermon these curious expressions are again repeated:—

‘Add ten to seven, and you have seventeen. By this number all the multitude of the perfect is typified; but how we arrive at a hundred and fifty-three I am accustomed to tell you, and many are beforehand with me. . . . Many have forgotten, some never heard; let those then that have heard and have not forgotten bear patiently with me, that others may be instructed.’

And then he goes on as before. The remarkable expression, ‘and many are beforehand with me,’ can scarcely be explained but by the supposition that people actually began to count on their fingers (as S. Augustine tells us in another place) when their preacher commenced the well-known topic; a method of interruption not at all without parallel in the primitive Church, as so many patristic allusions remain to show: whether the contempt with which S. Chrysostom rejects all open expressions of feeling, or the more than toleration with which the *quod non tacito honorastis affectu* of S. Leo receives them.

It seems next to certain that most of the *Sermones varii* of Venerable Bede were also extemporary. The extreme brevity of some of them, (for occasionally they do not exceed seven or eight lines,) renders it impossible that the preacher said no more than that which now stands in his works. And again, the great simplicity which characterises all, the repetition of words, and the reiteration of the noun instead of adoption of the pronoun, are just what we should expect to find in extemporaneous addresses to a very ignorant congregation. For example: one on the text, ‘Man that is born of a woman,’ &c., commences thus: ‘But the soul cannot die; but when it departs from the body, the body soon dies; and before it departs from the body, it is in great terror, because it sees S. Michael, who is waiting for it; and it is afraid to go forth on account of the bands of miserable souls.’ Bede then tells the celebrated story of S. Macarius and the head in the wilderness, and forthwith concludes; the sermon, as it stands now, taking about two minutes to deliver. No doubt some one of his disciples jotted down a brief abstract of what the preacher had said, very probably for his own use on some other occasion; and it is a collection of such abstracts that has since formed a part of the author’s works.

It is curious how long an impression prevailed that extemporary preaching was the invention of the Puritans. Some of

our readers may remember the amusing vehemence of indignation with which a writer, of whom the Church of England may certainly say, *Non tali auxilio*, pursues it in her 'Vicar of Wrexhill.' The truth is, that the innovation, which appears to date somewhere from the time of Queen Elizabeth, was the carrying a written sermon into the pulpit. The mediæval practice was no doubt the same with that of the continental churches of the present day, that the preacher should repeat from memory that which he had previously composed.

Another example or two to the same effect may be found in the works of S. Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, who died in 1134. In his sixty-third sermon we have this sentence: 'for Leon in Greek signifies a king.' It is manifest that Hildebert said, 'Basileon,'¹ and that the first two syllables were inaudible to the copyist. In the same discourse, also, the preacher lays great stress on the *seven* lions which stood on this side and on that of Solomon's throne, whereas Holy Scripture expressly declares that there were *twelve*, and the type was a celebrated one:

' Da, ad thronum gradibus
Senis conscendamus;
Bis senos leunculos
Tunc non timeamus.'

In like manner, and also arising from the hurry of extempore speaking, we find S. Hildebert frequently quoting Holy Scripture very inaccurately, even where a more literal citation would better have served his purpose. And again, there are passages where it is indeed possible to see what the author meant, but where no grammatical construction can elicit that meaning from the words as they stand. Such is one which we give in a note from the thirty-fourth sermon.²

A still more remarkable instance of the way in which an extempore sermon has reached us, is to be found by comparing the sixth and the sixty-first of the same author. The two are identical, though expressed, for the most part, in somewhat different words. The fact seems to have been, that both a monk of Saint Germain-des-Pres, and one of Angers, were present at the delivery of the discourse, and that each took notes for his own edification, he of Angers being the better reporter of the two. The consequence was, that the copies transcribed from the MSS. of the respective monasteries, appeared as two different sermons in the S. Maur edition. The editor, Beaugendre,

¹ The reader need scarcely be reminded how inaccurate in their terminations were mediæval writers when they had to quote a Greek word.

² Sed qui reconciliantur, alii finitâ pœnitentiâ parati ad Corpus Domini percipiendum, alii nondum digni sunt sacramentum, quia nondum pœnitentiam finierunt: sed ad gaudium tantæ festivitatis communicandi ex indulgentiâ ad tantum in Ecclesiâ vel recipiuntur, ut integrum corpus esse gaudeant, et de peccatis resurrectione hujus festivitatis ad suprema gaudia perennia.

observed the similarity of the two; and says in his note on the latter, 'This sermon has a great affinity with that on the Incarnation, which begins with the same words.' It is strange that the learned Benedictine did not see the origin of this affinity, or rather identity.

If we proceed from preaching strictly extemporary to preaching from notes, S. Antony of Padua would present the most striking example, could we be certain that he actually delivered the celebrated sermons which we now have from him. There is a clear distinction made in his life, between those which he preached with such wonderful effect to the people, and those which he wrote for the instruction and improvement of his brethren. 'The Bishop of Ostia,' says his biographer, 'exhorted him, when he had written his sermons *De Tempore*, to compose another series for the festivals of Saints. He obeyed, and while still at Padua, gave himself up to this work. But the holy time of Lent coming on, the man of God perceiving 'that now was 'the accepted time, now was the day of salvation, put off that 'composition, and applied himself wholly to preach to the people, 'who thirsted with great eagerness for his sermons.'

It is perhaps not improbable that what he wrote in brief, and by way of notes, was afterwards delivered in full, and with such extemporaneous additions as might occur. At all events, his work can only be called *sermon skeletons*, however much his editors may entitle it *Sermones Sancti Antonii*.

S. Hildebert, to whom we have just referred, affords, also, instances of preaching from notes. In a Lent sermon, for example, the following paragraph now occurs in the printed copies: 'Seek ye the Lord while He may be found; call upon 'Him because He is now swift to pardon, hereafter He will be 'prepared to judge. Learn by an example how swift He is to 'pardon. *And I will give an example.* Learn by this example, 'beloved brethren, to be instigated, without loss of time, to penitence, and to be converted to the Lord.' Who does not see that the words, 'and I will give an example,' were merely a marginal note, set down by the preacher for his own private use; such an instance of God's mercy as might happen to occur to him, being inserted, in the heat of delivery, extemporaneously?

Again, in the thirty-eighth sermon, which was preached to the nuns of Fontevraud, we have the following extraordinary abbreviation: 'Primus populus, homines sunt mali, qui a bono 'retrahunt; secundus, desideria carnis, quæ mala suggerunt; 'tertius, cogitationes mentis, quæ peccare cogunt. De primo 'populo scriptum est; Si d. m. t. S. t. a. esse pro
'De secundo: Abstinete vos a carnalibus desideriis, quæ militant adversus animam.'

The after insertions and marginal references which such a system of notes rendered necessary, are referred to by Herbert of Bosham, in the preface to his Gloss on the Psalter. 'If,' says he, to the prelate whom he is addressing, 'your scribes should undertake the transcription of these commentaries, let them take diligent care to insert the references and notes in their right order; lest, as it often happens, through the ignorance or the negligence of the transcriber, it should be more difficult to correct the work than it was to write it; especially when the corrupter of a new work may be called the brother of its destroyer.'

The third point which should be considered in the perusal of any mediæval sermon is this; whether it were originally delivered in Latin, or in the vernacular language of the country. It is difficult to understand in what sense, and with what limitations, we are to receive the account of Bishops who in those ages preached from one end of Europe to the other. Probably till the death of Charlemagne, an ecclesiastic who could make himself intelligible to any of the Romance nations which his empire embraced, would be comprehended by all; and in like manner, one who was understood by a single Tudesque race, would be intelligible to any other. If two languages only were necessary in an empire which stretched from Mecklenburg to Tarragona, and from Brittany to Rome, a great portion of the difficulty is obviated. But, in later ages, when we know that the dialects of different provinces in the same country had become in effect different languages,—when, for example, the Langue d'oui and the Langue d'oc were unintelligible to each other,—then how apostolic missionaries could traverse half Europe becomes a question of greater obscurity. One thing seems next to certain; that the great preachers of those times, whenever they did use the vernacular language, spoke in it extempore; for who would take the trouble of committing his thoughts to a dialect so barbarous that perhaps it could not be written with precision, and so fluctuating that it was certain to be unintelligible within half a century? The *Sermones ad Populum* of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, then, must either have been translated into Latin by some of the disciples of the author, from their remembrance of what he had actually spoken, or by the writer himself, from his recollection of the general scope and aim of his discourse.

We will now turn our attention to a few of the most distinguishing features which characterise mediæval sermons. And the first of these is, the immense and almost intuitive knowledge of Scripture which their writers possessed. If any one, to take the lowest view of the subject, will be at the trouble of com-

paring the number of references to be found in a modern, with those which occur in an ancient sermon, he will find that ten to one is by no means an exaggerated estimate of their relative proportions. Nor is this all. Modern quotations are almost entirely taken from certain books or chapters of the Bible; the more important portions, as men now-a-days irreverently, not to say profanely, call them. The ancient preachers drew their citations from all parts of Scripture alike: equally imbued with the spirit of all, it was impossible that they should quote otherwise than according to analogy. And those who more especially pique themselves on their knowledge of the Bible, and on declaring 'the whole counsel of God'—we mean, of course, the so-called Evangelicals—would do well to consider, how and why it is that their sermons, in comparison with those of which we are writing, are so jejune in references to the Word of God, and so shallow and common-place in their application when they quote it—why they evince, in short, rather the knowledge of a child than the full grasp of a theologian. Let us be fair, and give an example or two to prove the truth of what we say. We will take an unexceptionable writer on either side. The modern school cannot complain if we bring forward John Newton as their champion; and we will match him, not with S. Bernard, nor with any other such giant in divinity, but with a mere common-place pious writer of the twelfth century, Guarrie, Abbat of Igniac. We will take them on the same subject, and on the same text, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord.' In Newton's sermon we find nine references to the Gospels, two to the Epistles, nine to the prophets, one to the Psalms; while no allusion is made to any other part of Holy Scripture. In the sermon of Guarrie there are seven references to the Gospels, one to the Epistles, twenty-two to the Psalms, nine to the Prophets, and eighteen to other parts of Scripture. Thus, the total number of quotations made by the Evangelical preacher is twenty-one; by Guarrie, fifty-seven; and this in sermons of about equal length. Or, to take a more striking example of the same thing. In 1784, when the oratorio of the 'Messiah' was performed with great splendour in Westminster Abbey, it pleased the same John Newton to deliver a series of discourses on the texts which formed the subject of Handel's music. As those passages of Holy Scripture are so admirably well chosen, the sermons grounded on them were naturally intended to form a complete body of divinity, and as such were published together. By way of index, the author drew up a list of texts quoted or referred to, such as we see universally appended to the earlier editions of the Fathers. It is odd to remark how unequally the evangelical preacher makes his citations. From that part of the

Bible which precedes the Psalms he quotes very sparingly. The minor Prophets hardly furnish him with one passage; the Books of Joel, Obadiah, Nahum, and Jonah, absolutely with none. He nowhere refers to the Song of Solomon. To the Apocrypha, as might be expected, he makes but one allusion. The Epistles, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians, occupy a most disproportionable space, as regards the New Testament; and the prophecy of Isaiah, in reference to the Old. Now, if we turn to the same index in the works of S. Antony of Padua, we find at once that Holy Scripture is quoted evenly, and according to analogy. The historical books assume their due prominence; the Epistles are reduced to a lower level; and the quotations from each bear proportion to the length of the book, and not to the preconceived system of the preacher. The one point of similarity between S. Antony and Newton is the greater frequency with which both turn to the Psalms; and their most striking contrast, next to that which we have already specified, consists in the numerous references which the one makes to the Sapiential books, and, above all, to the Canticles; while, by the other, they are comparatively passed over.

But, after all, this is a very poor and imperfect way of representing the difference. Let us take another comparison, to show how, in the one case, the whole composition is imbued with Scripture; in the other, how detached texts are, as it were, tagged on, because it looked proper and sounded scriptural to introduce them. Let our preachers, each of them, commence a discourse upon Advent.

‘One strong internal proof that the Bible is a divine revelation, may be drawn from the subject matter, and particularly that it is the book, and the only book, which teaches us to think highly and honourably of God. I say the only book; for there is no right knowledge of God where the Bible is not known. What is the Jupiter of Homer compared with the God of Israel, as He is represented to us by His servants the Prophets? And if the heathen philosophers in some detached passages have sentiments not altogether unworthy of Him, history honestly tells us how they obtain them. They travelled, and they are generally said to have travelled into Phenicia or Egypt, to the confines of that people who alone thought rightly of God, because to them only He had made Himself known by a revelation. If such a description as we have in the fortieth chapter of Isaiah, from the twelfth verse to the end, had been known only of late years, recovered, we will suppose, out of the ruins of Herculaneum, there is little doubt but it would have engaged the attention and admiration of the learned world; for the most admired writings of antiquity, upon a candid comparison, are unspeakably inferior to it. The inimitable sublimity of the prophets is natural, just, and unforced, and flows from the grandeur of their subject, because they were influenced by Him Who alone can speak worthily of Himself.’

So much for the Rector of S. Mary Woolnoth; now for the writer of the dark ages:—

'We look for the Saviour. Verily, the expectation of the just, the joy of those that wait, is in that blessed hope, and the glorious Advent of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. And now, saith the righteous man, what is my hope? Truly my hope is even in Thee. And turning to the Lord, I know, he saith, that I shall not be disappointed of my hope, because my substance is before Thee; because our nature taken from us, and offered up for us, is glorified in Thee; leaving us the hope that all flesh shall come to Thee; and that the members may follow the Head, so that the burnt offering may be accomplished. But with fuller trust, because with safer conscience, that man may expect the Lord, who can say, The substance of my little possessions is before Thee, O Lord; because either by contributing them to Thee, or in despising them for Thee, I have treasured up my talents in heaven, and have laid them down at Thy feet, knowing that Thou art able to keep that which I have committed unto Thee; and not only to keep it, but to give me also an hundred-fold in the present life, and in the world to come eternal life. Blessed are ye, the poor in spirit, who, according to the counsel of the Wonderful Counsellor, lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven; lest, if your treasures should remain on earth, your hearts should also rot there. For, saith he, where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also. Therefore let our hearts go after their treasure; let our cogitations be fixed on high; let our expectation be suspended on the Lord, that we may say with the Apostle, Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour. For our fathers trusted in Thee, even all the just from the foundation of the world, they trusted in Thee, and were not confounded. And now we have received Thy loving-kindness in the midst of Thy Temple, and the band of Thy rejoicing servants sings together, Blessed is He That cometh in the name of the Lord: I waited patiently for the Lord, and He inclined unto me.'

Can there be a stronger contrast than between these two styles? The one priest speaks because it is Sunday morning, because the congregation are waiting for him, and because the publication of his sermons may possibly add to his fame or to his conveniences. The other, because his heart is full of his subject,—because in Advent-time he can manifestly think of nothing but the Advent, and therefore out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. Guarric, indeed, gives us no laboured panegyric on Scripture, nor does he even state, as Newton does, the superiority of the God of Christians over Jupiter. But he is in the heart of his subject in a moment; he seems to quote the Bible because it is his own natural language, because his thoughts have been so accustomed to flow in scripture channels that they will run in no other; and it is sometimes difficult to tell, nor would he perhaps always have known himself, whether he were employing his own words or those of the inspired writings.

But this subject of scriptural allusion is inseparably connected to that of the mystical interpretations with which primitive and mediæval sermons overflow. Those—as is perhaps the case with most of the present generation—who have been taught to look in scripture doctrines for doctrines only, and in scripture facts for facts only, naturally reject with scorn much

of the Biblical knowledge of the middle ages. 'You may have the words of Scripture,' they say, 'but where is the sense? The meanings elicited are often so childish, often so contrariant, always so far-fetched, that the true signification is utterly lost. The same method of interpretation may make anything out of anything; and the puritan who, preaching against the fashionable head-dress of the day, took for his text, "*Top not come down*," was scarcely a caricaturer of earlier mysticism.' Now we have not the least intention of entering on any disquisition as to the limits to which mystical interpretation may lawfully be carried. There can scarcely be a doubt that in some later writers it did overstep all possible bounds of moderation. For example, however true may be the doctrine that the clergy are to teach and the laity to learn, that there is to be an *ecclesia discens* as well as an *ecclesia docens*,—one can scarcely forbear a smile when the statement of this truth is concluded with a—'For it is written, "The oxen were ploughing, and the asses feeding beside them."'

There was much truth, at least as regards the seventeenth century, in the words of the great preacher, Vieyra, who, though he flourished then, may fairly be called the last of the mediæval divines:—

'But do not the preachers of this day preach the Gospel and Holy Scriptures? Then, how can they be said not to preach the word of God? Here is the evil. They preach the words of God, but they do not preach the word of God. The words of God, preached in the sense in which God spake them, are the word of God; but preached in the sense to which we choose to twist them, are not the word of God, and may be the word of the devil. Tell me, preachers, these useless interpretations which you so often bring forward, these meanings which to you appear so clever,—is this the sense in which God spoke? Is this the sense in which the Fathers of the Church understood? Is this the plain grammatical meaning of the words? "At the last came two false witnesses." Yet we find that Christ had truly said the words that they reported. Then why false? Because Christ spoke them in one sense, and they related them in another. Ah, Lord, how many false witnesses rise up against Thee now! How many times I hear Thee made to say that which Thou never didst say! How many times I hear something reported to be Thy word which is only my imagination! for I do not exclude myself from the number of the guilty.'¹

And, to do Vieyra justice, he could not.

S. Jerome had, indeed, given the same warning long before. 'They disdain to know,' said he, 'what the prophets or the Apostles meant; but bring forward inadequate quotations in support of their own meaning, and wrest Scripture, repugnant though it be, to their private convenience.' In like manner S. Charles Borromeo advises the preacher not to invent new and contorted allegories, but to be content with those already

¹ Sermones, tom. i. p. 70.

taught by the Fathers, and above all things to avoid the ingenious fancies of Origen.

Two things, however, must be borne in mind with respect to this mystical system. In the first place, Scripture itself authorizes it to a certain (and that a very considerable) extent. 'For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.' And again, still more remarkably, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen, or saith He not it *altogether* for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this was written:' where the primary signification is declared of no account, and the spiritual is made the principal meaning. But if it be once granted that the system is at all allowable, who can presume to set bounds to its exercise? It is remarkable, as Dr. Pusey observes, that, in Psalms which we, after deep thought, can see to be partially applicable to our Lord, we find S. Augustine declaring, almost as if by intuition, 'This Psalm breathes *altogether* of Christ.' Surely, however far mediæval mysticism may have been carried, it is, to use the evangelical term, more in accordance with the 'mind of the Spirit,' than that harsh and rigid Canon of Calvin's, which so many of his followers receive and applaud. It is, he taught, unsafe to find a type of Christ anywhere, except where it is pointed out to us in the New Testament. We may see Him, therefore, in the Paschal Lamb, but not in the sacrifice of Isaac; we may find Him in Melchisedec, but not in Joseph: He is represented to us by the Brazen Serpent, but not by the Ark of the Covenant. And evangelical writers on the Bible have not been sparing in their denunciations of the older system. Thus Scott, the so-called commentator, in reply to a question, whether the 'certain poor man,' who, as the Book of Ecclesiastes tells, delivered the City, and yet was not remembered, were intended as a type of Christ, thus expresses himself:—

'I would gladly know by what authority any man, overlooking plain useful instructions, by the help of a warm imagination sets himself to find gospel mysteries in this passage? It would puzzle the most ingenious of these fanciful expositors fairly to accommodate the circumstances of the story to the work of Redemption. Two purposes, indeed, such as they are, may be answered by such interpretation; 1stly, loose professors are encouraged in their vain confidence; 2dly, it is a powerful engine in the hands of vainglorious men, by which to catch the attention and excite the imagination of the injudicious multitude.'

Mediæval preachers, indeed, knew perfectly well that such interpretations *are* powerful engines, as all sermons ought to be. They knew with how much force such a text as, 'But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore,' speaks to the heart, when the morning is interpreted of the Resurrection, and

the shore, of the harbour of everlasting rest after the waves of this troublesome world; they knew what beauty is thrown round the verse, 'With my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands,' when the Cross, and the River of Death, and the preserved Angels, and restored Man, are typified by it. And if in any instance mediæval preaching pushed these interpretations to extravagance, it is surely better that we should see Christ everywhere, with Cocceius, than that we should see Him nowhere, with Grotius.

It is necessary also to bear in mind the great difference between basing a doctrine on an allegorical interpretation, and merely referring to that interpretation, in its support and illustration. That from the very earliest times we have instances of the first method of quotation no one will deny, whatever opinion may be formed as to the legitimacy of the practice. At Nicæa, the Catholic text was, as all the world knows, 'My heart hath produced a good word.' Afterwards, in the controversies with Semi-Arians and Macedonians, that verse was thought irrefragable, 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.' Still later, Jovinian and his fellows were overthrown by the quotation from Ezekiel,—'This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore shall it be shut,'—so constantly cited in defence of the perpetual virginity of S. Mary.

But allusions by way of reference stand on a very different footing. A congregation on S. Laurence's day was reminded, in the words of the Book of Deuteronomy, that 'His bedstead was a bedstead of iron.' The ecclesiastic about to preach on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul took for his text, 'And God made two great lights.' On S. Martin's day a favourite subject was, 'And Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that was upon him, and gave it to David.' Was reference made to the perpetual presence of Christ with His Church?—the passage was adduced, 'The heart of her husband shall safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil.' Was the hearer warned against the sin of gluttony, as the destroyer of the soul?—he was reminded that Jerusalem was taken by Nabuzaradan, 'Prince of the Cooks.' Nor were puns thought unbecoming in pointing an allusion. On S. Vincent's day the subject of the sermon would be, 'To *Vincent* will I grant to sit with me in my throne.' Sometimes, indeed, the reference is to us rather revolting than edifying. Thus, on S. Laurence's day, the text occurs—the reference is of course to the kind of martyrdom which that saint offered as it were to Christ, and to the fish as the type of every Christian—'And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish.

And then, after all, though we should remove the whole of these symbolical expositions from mediæval sermons, look at the residuum, that which every one would be glad to say if it entered their minds, and which every one when it is once pointed out to them will wonder that they did not say. How infinitely greater a knowledge of Scripture does it exhibit, how infinitely closer investigation and deeper study does it show, than that of the most famous among our own commentators! The mere outside facts of Scripture, those historical events which we make it our boast that English children are taught, how they are slurred over in the writings of our own authors! To go no further than the 1st chapter of Genesis. There are three remarkable points which, from S. Ambrose till the Reformation, were discussed and re-discussed, but which by modern annotators are altogether unnoticed:—why the second day had no blessing, why the third and sixth days had two blessings, and why, after the statement that God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,’—the historical narrative continues, that we were formed in the *image*, but says nothing about the *likeness* of the Creator. Even if we grant that the explanations of these passages are forced and fanciful,—which system shows the greater reverence for the letter of Scripture; that of those who pass over such facts as not worthy of attention, or of those who laboriously, even should it be also unsuccessfully, investigate them?

Such commentators, however, have ere now defended themselves by referring to Lord Bacon’s not over-wise dictum—that, as wines made from the first crush of the grape are the purest, so the easiest interpretations of Scripture are the most profitable. The philosopher might have remembered that the liquor which flows from that first crush is not wine at all, but a crude and unwholesome beverage. It cannot be denied that our modern interpreters have abundantly acted on his recommendation.

Thus, the practical observations which take up so large a portion of ‘Scott’s Commentary’ are such as some men would not take the trouble of even thinking, many would not be at the pains of speaking, and—one should have imagined, were not the fact as it is—such as no man would have condescended to write down. Take an example. If ever there was an Old Testament History which evidently contained a deep spiritual meaning, it is that of Leah and Rachel. The two sisters, like Mary and Martha in the New Testament, have sometimes been held to set forth the active and the contemplative life; and there is a sublime passage in S. Augustine (*Contra Faustum*, 22, 52,) based on this idea;—sometimes as the types of earthly and heavenly life; sometimes as the synagogue and the Church—and

the allusions which occur all through the middle ages to this most common symbolism have invested it with no small share of beauty. So Bernard of Cluny:—

‘Tunc Jacob Israel et Lia tunc Rachel efficietur:
Tunc Sion atria pulchraque patria perficietur.’

So Adam of S. Victor:—

‘Lippam Liam latent multa,
Quibus videns Rachel fulta
Pari nubit foedere.’

So again, the panegyrist of S. Thomas:—

‘Post Agar ludibrium Saræ natus datur;
Post Liam ad libitum Jacob uxoratur.’

But on this history, pregnant as it is with meaning, Scott the Commentator has nothing better to remark than what follows:—

‘One cannot but lament to see Jacob cheated into polygamy in so extraordinary a manner, and indeed the malice and artifice of Laban are clearly discernible in the transaction. The Lord, however, so sets one thing against another, that there is less difference in the comparative happiness of mankind than superficial observers imagine; and in the most ordinary circumstances of private life His hand should be acknowledged, especially when he relieves our distresses and answers our prayers.’

Much on this subject may be learnt from the *Concordantiæ Morales* of S. Antony of Padua. This is a collection of texts, arranged under different heads, for the convenience of the preacher, and containing five books. There is scarcely a moral or religious subject which is not thus treated at length. The last book is especially taken up with passages suited to the festivals of the Christian year. Consider the admirable wisdom with which the following texts are selected, under the head that we ought to be solicitous to help forward each other's salvation:— Genesis iv. 9: ‘Where is Abel thy brother?’ Exodus xxvi. 3: ‘The five curtains shall be coupled together, one to another.’ Isaiah ii. 3: ‘Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.’ Jeremiah xvi. 16: ‘Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them.’ S. John i. 45: ‘Philip findeth Nathanael.’ S. John iv. 28: ‘The woman then left her water-pot, and went her way into the city.’ Rev. xxii. 17: ‘And let him that heareth say, Come.’

These selections are highly valuable, as showing the character of the subjects which the popular preacher of the thirteenth century was in the habit of choosing. The following are for the Feast of S. Andrew. We will not deprive our readers of the opportunity of exercising their ingenuity in the explanation of some of them.

Genesis viii. 20: 'Noah builded an altar unto the LORD; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered them upon the altar.'

Numbers xii. 3: 'Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth.' (The mediæval attribute of S. Andrew. *Andrea pie, sanctorum mitissime*, says the Sarum Hymnal.)

Judges vii. 3: 'Whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return and depart early from Mount Gilead.'

2 Kings iv. 32: 'And when Elisha came into his house, behold, the child was dead, and laid upon his bed.'

Judith vi. 13: 'They bound Achior, and cast him down, and left him at the foot of the hill, and returned to their lord.'

Job xxiii. 11: 'My foot hath held His steps; His way have I kept, and not declined.'

Job xxxix. 21: 'He paweth in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength: he goeth forth to meet the armed men.'

Canticles vii. 8: 'I said, I will go up to the palm tree; I will take hold of the boughs thereof.'

Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 16: 'As the turpentine tree I stretched out my branches, and my branches are the branches of honour and grace.'

S. Luke xix. 4: 'And he ran before, and climbed up into a sycamore tree to see Him: for He was to pass that way.'

In addition to which we have the more usual texts from the Epistle and Gospel for the day.

Here is another example, for sermons addressed to Diocesan Synods:—

Genesis xxxi. 38: 'These twenty years have I been with thee; thine ewes and thy she-goats have not cast their young.'

2 Samuel xxiii. 8: 'These be the names of the mighty men whom David had.'

1 Kings xx. 39: 'Keep this man; if by any means he shall be missing, thy life shall be for his life.'

Proverbs xxvii. 23: 'Be thou diligent to know the state of thy flocks, and look well to thy herds.'

Ecclesiasticus x. 2: 'As the judge of the people is himself, so are his officers.'

Ecclesiasticus xxxii. 1: 'If thou be made the master, lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest; take diligent care for them, and so sit down.'

Something of the same kind may be traced in the writings of Bishop Andrewes and his contemporaries, who also afford many instances of a practice so dear to mediæval writers, that of eliciting a prodigious depth of meaning from one comparatively unimportant word. Thus William Austin, one of the most devotional writers, though a layman, of the time of King James the First, has left a sermon on the words, *And Bartholomew*, for S. Bartholomew's day. After noticing, what is perfectly true, that the name Bartholomew never appears in Scripture without being preceded by the copulative particle, he proceeds to dilate on the Christian duty and benefit of mutual help and assistance; a doctrine which is thus entirely evolved from the one word, *And*. The ingenious repartee with which

a preacher of this kind was once met is well known. Having become a candidate for some lectureship, he was required, in his turn, to exhibit his talents in the pulpit; and naturally wishing to make the most of them, he took for his text the word *But*. He thence deduced the truth that no lot is without its cross. Naaman was a mighty man of valour, and honourable, *but*—he was a leper. The five wicked cities were as fruitful as the garden of God; *but*—the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly. The inhabitants of Ai thought that they had put the Israelites to flight; *but*—they wist not that there were liars in wait behind the city. When our divine returned to the vestry, he was met by the principal trustee of the lectureship with the appropriate observation,—‘Sir, it was a most ingenious sermon, and ‘we are exceedingly obliged to you for having delivered it; ‘*but*—you are not the preacher that will do for us.’ An undesigned piece of symbolism once lost an Irish divine the mitre. Sheridan, the friend of Dean Swift, was requested by a country clergyman to take his duty for him on the next Sunday. The doctor, then high in favour at Dublin Castle, complied, and preached an old sermon on the words, ‘Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.’ It happened that the Sunday in question was the anniversary of the accession of the House of Hanover; and the supposed insult was never forgiven. The story told of Paley, that he proposed as a text for a University sermon when Pitt, then Prime Minister, was expected to be present, ‘There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves and two small fishes,’ is well known.

At the same time it will be found that the more recondite texts were generally addressed *ad clerum*; and that sermons preached to parish congregations are almost always based on the Gospel or the Epistle of the day. This custom, in many parts of Europe, acquired almost the force of a law; and a remarkable relic of it still exists in a communion which has preserved much of the husk of the earlier Church,—the Swedish Establishment. Here the preacher is to this day compelled to take his text either from the Epistle or from the Gospel; and so inconvenient has the law been found, that at the present moment, we believe, a commission is sitting for the addition of fresh Epistles and Gospels, not to be used in the Liturgy, but to afford a greater variety of texts to the preacher. Bishop Cosin, who, with all his excellences, would have introduced something of a cast-iron system into ecclesiastical polity, laments in one of his sermons that permission had been given to the clergy to choose their texts from any other portion of Scripture than those appointed for the day.

It would be curious to learn when it became the established practice in England that a sermon must have a text, and that a text must be taken from Scripture. Neither was a requisite in earlier times. Thus we sometimes find it selected from an Antiphon. Peter of Blois has a sermon on S. Andrew's Day, of which the text is,—*Salve, crux preciosa: suscipe discipulum ejus qui pependit in te; magister meus, Christus.* And this is a very common practice among modern Russian preachers, who frequently hang their sermons on a *troparion* instead of a verse of Scripture. There are innumerable instances in which the sermon begins without any text at all, and some in which the verse of a hymn forms the text. Thus, for example, Peter de Celle preaches from that stanza—

‘Gloria tibi Domine,
Qui natus es de Virgine,
Cum Spiritu Paraclito
Et nunc, et in perpetuum.’

So Venerable Bede takes his text from the

‘Felix per omnes festum mundi cardines
Apostolorum præpollet alacriter,’ &c.

Next to the intimate knowledge of Scripture which mediæval writers display, their power of adapting themselves to the wants and requirements of the poor and ignorant is one of their most remarkable characteristics. It was not, we may be sure, without cause that such crowds of peasants flocked to hear men like S. Thomas Aquinas. The power which these great divines possessed of taking nothing for granted as known by their hearers, of explaining even those circumstances which would seem to need no explanation, of describing everything, and leaving nothing to the possibility of a mistake, well deserves to be imitated by us. It is not without deep reason, though at first sight the observation seems absurd, that Gretser, the great German divine, while discussing the question, whether our Lord were nailed to the Cross before or after its elevation, determines on the former; ‘because,’ says he, ‘it is more convenient to the Christian’s imagination that it should so have been.’ And not only by simplicity and clearness, but by striking stories, homely proverbs, and appropriate similes, did these great men find their way to the hearts of the poor. Thus the worthy Archdeacon of Bath, Peter of Blois, preaching professedly to the people, relates a long allegory, based on the *psychomachia* of Prudentius, in which the contest of Faith with her various opponents is set forth. The whole sermon is a curious example of what was thought suitable for, and (as the phrase goes) *took* with, a village congregation in Somersetshire, about the year 1180. It must have occupied at least two hours in the delivery, a length for which the author apologises in a

short preface. It seems that the sermon made a sensation, and that some friend of the writer requested him to give it a wider circulation by translating it into Latin. 'I shall not be 'astonished,' he says in reply, 'either if you keep it to yourself, 'after reading it, or throw it by, or burn it, or tear it into the 'smallest pieces you can; nor must you be surprised if I have 'transgressed the brevity of an ordinary sermon, since the 'dignity of the Latin language requires that what in the 'vulgar tongue may be spoken shortly and hurriedly, should be 'expressed with greater length and fulness.' Another interesting sermon, of the same writer's, on All Saints Day, is clearly addressed to a poor congregation, and is occupied in pointing out, on the one hand, the blessings of poverty; and, on the other, the danger of the mistake which would confound the poor of this world with the poor in spirit. From another discourse, preached after a Confirmation, we will make some extracts, because it is not uninteresting to read the very words addressed to an English congregation seven hundred years ago, which we might with great profit employ now; and because it is singular to find the lower view of Confirmation, that which refers to the promise renewed rather than to the grace received, brought the most prominently forward. The preacher introduces Satan as pleading against the sinner at the last day:—

'This man renounced in baptism me and all my works and all my pomps; and then, forgetful of his promise, as quickly as he could he surrendered himself to him whom he had renounced, went about his work, and took delight in his vanities. But when he came to a sense of what he had done, he changed his determination for the better. Be it so, that he returned to Thee; be it so that "the wicked forsook his ways and the unrighteous man his thoughts," and went back to Thee, and Thou didst have mercy on him. Be it so: it is manifest that he again altered his resolution for the worse, and the "latter end of that man was worse than the first." I will prove it. Remember, I beseech Thee, that before Thy vicar, before Thine anointed, before Thy minister, he renewed the covenant of baptism, and bound himself by the promise which he again uttered. Here at least he cannot excuse himself on account of age; he cannot assert that he came by compulsion; he cannot pretend insufficiency. He came before Thy minister, of full understanding and not in infancy; he promised voluntarily, and not by over persuasion; he boldly and freely took on his shoulders a burden which he could have borne. What more? In one and the same moment, he departed from Thy minister and forsook his promise: he deceived Thy priest, he deceived Thee, he deceived himself; he cast away Thy light yoke and easy burden, and embraced the ancient slavery of sin: he cast away the garment of innocence, and again took up that which he had left with his Egyptian mistress. And wilt Thou not, O righteous Judge, allow that *he* is a betrayer, who, when he has eaten of Thy bread, has lifted up "his heel against thee?" Was not the hand of him that betrayed Thee with Thee on the table, when this man, who ate the bread of angels, the bread which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world, nevertheless cast in his lot with Thine enemies, "walked in the counsel of the ungodly, stood in the way of

sinners; and," which is more wicked yet, yea, which is most wicked of all, glories that he "sat in the seat of the scornful?" Either allow that he is a betrayer, or reject Thine Augustine, who expressly says, that "his sin is as great who betrays Christ to sinful members, as his was, who gave Him up to the Jews that crucified Him."

And so the good Archdeacon goes on, speaking with a plainness which shows that he knew his way to the hearts of those Somersetshire villagers, as well as how to direct the Church's course in the troubles that followed the martyrdom of S. Thomas of Canterbury.

But of all preachers who knew how to impress a country congregation, Venerable Bede must have been one of the most remarkable. Take up the first book of modern sermons that comes to hand,—such discourses, we mean, as call themselves plain and simple, and are addressed to ignorant labourers: look how in describing the consequences of sin in another world, the preacher speaks so vaguely, generalizes so indistinctly, and employs such difficult expressions, that one may be very sure his hearers must have left the church, if with any impression at all, certainly with one of the vaguest and least practical character. Now listen to Bede, preaching on the torments of hell—(we must, of course, do him the justice to believe that he considered the legend on which he founds his description to be of authority. We quote it for the language only):—

'There were here trees all on fire, and sinners were tormented on those trees; some hanging by the feet, some by the hands, some by the hair, some by the neck, some by the tongue, some by the arm. And again he beheld a burning fiery furnace, with seven fires; and many were punished in it; and there were seven plagues round about the furnace. The first, snow; the second, ice; the third, fire; the fourth, blood; the fifth, serpents; the sixth, lightning; the seventh, stench. And in that furnace were punished the souls of sinners who had not repented in this world; there they are tormented, and each receives according to that he has done. Some weep, some howl, some groan, some burn, and desire to have rest, but find none, because the soul can never die. Truly, brethren, we ought to fear that place in which is everlasting woe, in which is groaning, in which is sadness without joy, in which is abundance of tears on account of the misery of souls. After that he saw a horrible abyss, in which were many diabolical beasts, like fishes in the middle of the sea, which were devouring the souls of sinners. And he beheld also, between heaven and earth, the soul of a sinner which had that day departed from the world, howling in the midst of seven devils; and the angels cried out against it, and said,—Woe to thee, wretched soul! What hast thou done in thy lifetime? Thou hast despised the commandments of God, thou hast wrought no good works, and therefore thou shalt be cast into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. After this, angels, in one moment, carried a soul from the body to heaven, and he heard the voice of a thousand spirits rejoicing on its account, and saying, O happy and most blessed soul! to-day thou shalt be filled with joy, because thy works have been good: and they carried it into the presence of God, Who rendered to it according to its doings.'

One cannot doubt that Bede was, what we know him, from contemporaneous accounts, to have been, a most effective preacher; and not the less so because he always contented himself with making one impression in one sermon. Here we may notice one great point of difference between those ancient and our modern preachers. The former, well knowing that an ignorant congregation is capable of carrying away only one great idea at one time, dwelt on the main subject of their discourse up to the very end. If they had been describing the torments of hell, with the torments of hell they concluded; if they had been speaking of the glories of Paradise, they took care that no after-words should divert the attention of their hearers from those glories. We, for the most part, do just the contrary. We think it necessary to add something at the end of a sermon, lest the auditors should go away with a one-sided idea of truth. If we have been terrifying them by the prospect of God's vengeance, we cannot be content without throwing in something about His mercy as a makeweight. We forget that sermons addressed to the poor must necessarily be treated strongly and coarsely; and so we act much as the painter would, who should finish with the elaboration of a miniature a fresco intended to be looked at from a distance only. We will again quote Vieyra:—

'A sermon ought to have one theme only, and to be of one material only. This is why Christ said that the sower in the parable sowed, not many kinds of seeds, but one. A sower went forth to sow his *seed*,—his *seed*, not his *seeds*. If the labourer were first to sow wheat, and over that rye, and over that millet, and over that barley, what would spring up? A tangled forest, a green confusion. And so it is with sermons of this kind. The Baptist converted many in Judea; but how many subjects did he take? One only: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord:" preparation for the kingdom of Christ. Jonah converted the Ninevites; but on how many themes did he dilate? On one only: "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown:" the subversion of the city. So it is; Jonah in forty days preached but on one subject; and we in one hour preach on forty.'

To the same purpose also speaks Guibert of Nogent in the treatise to which we have before alluded.

'When,' says he, 'the preacher is possessed of great powers of mind, and has an excellent memory for the matter he is about to treat, he should consider the weakness of those who are his hearers, and remember how much better it is that a few things should be heard with pleasure, and retained, than that out of a multitude nothing should be carried away; and should, therefore, not be too long, in order that when he is about to preach again, the people may be willing, and not disgusted auditors.'

Another thing well worthy of attention in mediæval sermons addressed to the poor, is the infinite care with which their writers seem to have avoided difficult expressions, and trains of thought liable to be misunderstood. And this is the more remarkable

because, in their translation from the language in which they were preached to that in which we read them, they necessarily lost much of their simplicity. We constantly find expressions inserted in the Latin which could not have occurred in the original; as, for example, where Peter of Blois, in a discourse which we know to have been preached in the vulgar tongue, says concerning the soul of the sinner, *Vertit se in cœnum, non in cœlum*; a pun which manifestly could not have occurred in English, and which must have been inserted as an after-thought.

In contrast to this care, we will mention two modern anecdotes. One is related by an eminent living prelate, who, with the greatest good humour, is in the habit of telling it as a warning to his clergy to preach plainly. While he was still serving a curacy, he was anxious to try his hand at extempore preaching, and, accordingly, took for his text, 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.' On this subject he dwelt, much to his satisfaction, for the usual time; he proved from the works of creation, from the construction of our own bodies, and from the other usual topics, that there must be a creative power, and that that creative power is God. He came down from the pulpit with the comfortable conviction that he had not done so badly after all. Happening to walk home with a farmer who had attended the service, he was anxious to learn what impression he had produced, and, accordingly, made some observation which led to the point he wished to introduce. 'A very capital sermon you gave us, Mr. B.,' remarked his companion; 'but somehow I can't help thinking there be a God, for all you said.'

The other anecdote was related to us by another prelate of our Church. He happened to be staying in a country village, when a stranger was accidentally called in to preach. His text was, 'There was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus by night.' His sermon was very much to the point, so far as educated persons were concerned. But, on the following day, the Bishop happened to inquire of an old woman in the parish, if she had understood, and how she had liked, the discourse. 'Very much indeed,' was her reply; 'and I always *did* hear say that it was by night the fairies danced on Harborough Hill.' So much for the preacher's description of the character of the Pharisees.

The present writer may lay claim to the praise which Dryden bestowed on Milbourne,—that of being the 'fairest of critics,'—by relating a somewhat similar circumstance which happened to—the reviewer's mysterious singular plurality—'ourselves.' We had been preaching on the subject of baptism, and had

tried to explain, in the most popular way we could, the distinction between regeneration and conversion, dwelling particularly on the difference between the *one* baptism and the repeated repentances. We thought, like the excellent prelate to whom we have referred, that we had been particularly intelligible; and, perhaps with some little idea of being praised for our plainness, we afterwards made some observation to the most intelligent auditor in a very ignorant congregation. 'The very best sermon I ever heard preached,' was his remark; 'I had never seen so clearly before that, when we have fallen into sin, we can be baptized again to get out of it.'

Another method by which the old preachers reached the hearts of their poor hearers, was by the introduction of every-day proverbs and household sayings. Thus, Peter of Blois, in preaching on the guardianship of angels, is dwelling on the cause of their love to us. 'It is,' says he, 'for God's sake, the richness of whose mercy they see poured around us. For no man hath greater love than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Therefore, they know that He loved us, because He gave His life for us. It is a common saying, "Love me, love my dog" (*Qui me diligit, et canem meum*). And would that we *were* dogs, and then we should lick the sores of our sins; or, at least, whelps, and then we should eat of the crumbs that fall from our Master's table.' So Hrabanus Maurus, the universal scholar of the ninth century, in speaking of the temptation of our Lord. 'Then,' says he, 'was Jesus led up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. Talk of the devil, and he is sure to appear. But how? you will say. You have even now mentioned him, and he appears not.' On which the Archbishop proceeds to dwell on the invisible presence and never-failing temptations of Satan; and a very good sermon he hangs on the proverb in question. So again, Guarric of Igniac makes a remarkable use of a proverb in an Advent sermon. 'The Lord,' he says, 'thus speaks by His prophet, My people shall hang on My return. It is well and properly said; *shall hang*, as it were, between heaven and earth. They are neither able to ascend to heavenly things, nor willing to descend to earth. The common proverb tells us, "It is ill waiting while one is hanging." But I say, it is well waiting while one is so hanging. My soul chooses this suspension of its own free will, and only desires to hang on such a cross until it shall depart from the body.' One more example is the following: Guibert of Nogent, in a Lent sermon, is speaking of the patience necessary to a Christian, that he may bear the cross before he can gain the crown. 'And notice this,' he says; 'Christ declares ye have need of patience, that

‘after ye have done the will of God, ye might inherit the promise. On the contrary, the devil testifies, and says, “A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.” But the eggs of such birds are like the cockatrice’s eggs, whereof the prophet makes mention, that bring no advantage, but rather confusion and trouble.’

In the same way, mediæval preachers are constantly introducing anecdotes and stories to illustrate any point which may occur. Take an example from a sermon by an unknown mediæval writer, on the sin of pride, and the merit which humility possesses in the eyes of God:—

‘It happened on a certain night, in the monastery of Heisterbach, that the precenter began the Antiphon of the Invitatory, and the brother who stood next to him pitched his voice too low in intoning the psalm. Here-
envic, who was then prior, with the other elders carried on the chant on the same note on which it had been begun. Now, there was a certain youth, somewhat wanting in wisdom, who stood at the lower end of the choir; and being indignant that the tone should be pitched so low, he exalted his voice about five notes above the rest. His superiors resisted, but he would not yield, and some who were on the opposite side of the choir assisted him; whence, on account of the scandal and discord, the elders gave way. Presently, the abbat beheld the devil gliding away from the monk who had thus won the day into the opposite choir, and there mingling with the brethren who had assisted him. Whence we gather that more pleasing to God is a tone pitched too low, if it be accompanied with devotion of heart, than voices arrogantly exalted to the sky.’

S. Aelred of Rievaulx, whom one pictures as a kind, white-haired old man, surrounded by monks in the first fervour of their devotion, is very fond of relating such stories. Here is one. ‘I am acquainted,’ says he, ‘with a convent under the direction of the holy father Gilbert,’—that is, S. Gilbert of Sempringham,—‘in which there was, and there may be still, a certain virgin distinguished for sanctity of life.’ He proceeds to relate the visions which this nun reported to her sisters, and goes on: ‘There was, in the same convent, a woman of great discretion, who, knowing that we are not to trust every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God, believed that all these appearances were to be attributed to disease, or to some illusion of the fancy.’ The worthy Abbat next tells how this nun investigated the subject, and was at length convinced of her want of faith: ‘a narration,’ he observes, ‘which may not be uselessly inserted as an illustration of the advantage which faith possesses over reason.’

It would be endless to refer to all the stories which the sermons of Bede contain, whose great delight it seems to have been to find some anecdote which would suit his subject and his auditors, and to dwell on hardly anything else. It is worth noting, that the French preachers of the middle ages, such as

S. Bernard, S. Fulbert of Chartres, S. Hildebert of Tours, Marbod of Rheims, appear to have been far less given to this kind of narrations than their English and German brethren. Again; S. Antony of Padua, the most popular, perhaps, of all preachers who ever lived, has very little of the kind; but his sermons are remarkable for the profuse illustrations they receive from the occupations and trades of those whom he is addressing. Here are some examples, in which he accommodates natural history, or, at least, that which he considered such, to his own purposes. Exhorting to repentance in Lent, he says:—

‘Natural historians tell us that the smaller bees are the better workers; they have subtle wings, and their colour is black; but the handsomer bees are of the number of those who do nothing. The small bees are penitents, who are little in their own eyes, and are always employed about some work, lest the devil should come and find their house empty and idle. They also have subtle wings, which are contempt of the world, and love of the heavenly kingdom; by which elevating themselves from this earth, they more subtly contemplate the glory of God. They are also of a dark colour, whence in the first of Canticles the penitent soul saith, “I am black, but comely.”’

One can imagine the bee-keepers of a part of Italy famous for its honey, particularly edified by a comparison of this kind. S. Antony is fond of similes drawn from bees. Here is another, from the sermon on the third Sunday after Trinity:—

‘Penitents ought to do as the bees, who, when their king flies from the hive, fly with him, and crowd closely round him,—he in the middle, and they on every side; and when the king can fly no longer, the company of bees carries him; and if he dies, they all die together with him. Christ, our King, flew to us from the hive, that is to say, from the bosom of the Father, whom we ought to follow like good bees, and to fly with Him, and to place Him, that is, His faith, in the midst of us, that is, in our hearts. And if any one of His members shall have fallen into sin, we ought to support and to bear him up, and to die with Christ crucified and dying, crucifying our own flesh, with its affections and lusts.’

And this comparison of the Apostles to ichneumons is rather amusing:—

‘There is a certain little serpent which rolls itself in the mud, and thus enters the mouth of the sleeping crocodile, who wakes up, and swallows it down; on which it eats through his entrails, and comes out through his side. Thus the Apostles, rolled as it were in the mud of poverty and humility, leapt boldly into the mouths of tyrants, and openly contradicted their words of unbelief, and were thus devoured by death. Nevertheless, these tyrants themselves were thus slain, and those Apostles came forth alive from them, when their death redounded to the augmentation of the faith, and to the honour of Christ.’

Vieyra, the last of mediæval preachers, dearly loves to introduce an anecdote. The first of those we will quote has to do with our own country:—

‘Let me tell you what happened to me when I was in England. There went with me two Portuguese, who on a Sunday set themselves to play at

dice at the inn. In comes the host, much disturbed, and well-nigh out of his senses; "And," says he, "what, gentlemen! do you wish them to burn down my house?" "To burn down your house! and why?" "Because this is a game which can be heard out of doors; and if the magistrates knew of it, I should be a lost man." So the landlord said, and so it would have been. And, to make you wonder the more, the city or town was Dover, a maritime port, where all the inhabitants, without one single exception, are heretics. O shame of us, who pride ourselves so much on the name of Catholics! If in a land of heretics it is sacrilege to play at dice on an ordinary Sunday, what ought it to be to play at such games in Holy Week, in a land where the cross and the image of Christ are adored, and the mysteries of His death are celebrated?"

Here is another story related by the same preacher. The sermon, we should say, was delivered at Maranhão, in Brazil:—

'As I was sailing from here to Parà, I saw a vast quantity of fish, of a kind which I had never before observed, leaping up every now and then from the water. They told me that the Portuguese sailors called them *Four-eyes*. I wished, therefore, to investigate for myself the reason of this name, and I found that in real truth they have four eyes, each perfect and entire. Give thanks to God, I said, and praise the liberality of His divine providence; for to eagles, which are the lynxes of the air, and to lynxes, which are the eagles of the earth, He has given but two, and to you, little fish, he has given four. But I soon found something else more worthy of wonder in the circumstance, and in the place. So many instruments of vision in a worm of the sea, on the very shores of those vast lands where God has permitted, for so many ages, that so many thousands of heathen should be living in blindness. Oh! how deep and incomprehensible are the reasons of God, and how profound is the abyss of His judgments!'

And here is yet another example. He is preaching on the text, 'Ye know not what ye ask.' After explaining the text, 'Ask, and it shall be given you,' he continues:—

'It is better to ask, and to be refused with Paul, than to ask, and to be heard with Satan. How many lost souls are there now in hell, who are bitterly lamenting that their temporal petitions were granted! How many predestinated ones are there in heaven, who are rendering thanks to God that He refused to hear them on earth! Let a saint, who has preached in this same pulpit, bear witness to this same thing. There was in India a nobleman, intimately acquainted with S. Francis Xavier, who had a request to make to Don João the Third. He therefore asked the saint to furnish him with a letter to his companion, Simon Rodriguez, who was tutor to the prince, and high in favour with the king. S. Francis accordingly wrote, and this was the tenour of his letter:—Don Such-an-one is an excellent friend to myself and to the company. He has a petition to lay before the king. I adjure your reverence, by the obligations which we owe to this nobleman, that you will use your utmost endeavours in causing him to fail in his object, for I have observed that he who succeeds in getting on well in India, succeeds also in getting on well towards hell. And so it is still,' as he finely continues, 'with us as it was with him. Oh how many candidates for the Left Hand; oh how many petitioners for eternal damnation are there in all the courts of Christendom; men who know not what they say, nor for what they are pleading! Therefore it is that we read of the Spirit interceding for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. Woe for thee, blinded man, for thou knowest not the danger into which thou art rushing. Woe for thee, who art seeking such a government,

such a seat in such a council, such an office in such a colony. Thou art longing for Brazil; to Brazil thou wilt go, and ruin thy salvation: thou art petitioning for Angola; to Angola thou wilt be sent, and wilt damn thyself: thou art longing for India; thou wilt pass the Cape of Good Hope, and so lose all hope of eternal felicity.'

The introduction of stories into sermons naturally leads to the consideration of those who have employed ludicrous as well as serious means of fixing the attention of their auditors. It would seem that the most celebrated popular preachers have, in all countries and in all ages, felt a tendency to excite laughter, in its turn, as well as other emotions. From the cause we have mentioned above, it is not easy to speak with certainty of S. Antony of Padua; but, judging from the skeletons of his discourses, he, in his laborious missions through the north of Italy, was no exception to the rule. S. Robert of Arbrissel, who, in a most corrupt and barbarous age, was the apostle of Central France, gave way to what some might be disposed to call downright buffoonery. Peter of Celles, the most popular preacher in the same country towards the end of the twelfth century, has frequent turns that must have excited, and must have been intended to excite, a smile. S. Thomas of Villanova, in the sixteenth century, sometimes pursued a similar course. In the great Portuguese reform of the same century, the celebrated preachers—whom, perhaps, as popular haranguers, the Church has never seen equalled—Simon Rodriguez, Ignacio Martinz, and others, were noted for the same disposition. In our own country, Bishop Andrewes has passages which cannot be read, and could scarcely have been heard, without a smile. The case was the same with those who, if the producing a great effect constitutes a great preacher, certainly deserve that name, the Methodist missionaries of the eighteenth century,—John Wesley himself, Whitfield, Cennick, and others. Here, as might be expected, unrestrained by the discipline of the preachers whom we have before named, they frequently became little better than buffoons; as was the case also with Rowland Hill, and, still more coarsely, with Berridge; both, nevertheless, men possessing great power in addressing a popular audience. It would not be difficult to match, among the many puns of the mediæval pulpit, that sentence of Rowland Hill, in preaching at Wapping, which, notwithstanding all its vulgarity, is said to have produced a startling effect:—'Who can dare to despair of the mercy of God, when it can extend itself to heinous sinners, to great sinners, to mighty sinners, yea, and to *Wapping* sinners?' A pun of even a more curious nature was introduced, if we remember right, by S. Ivo of Chartres, when preaching at a monastery very much infested with dissensions and quarrels, of which the abbat was the principal cause. 'My

‘brethren,’ said the bishop, ‘if it is the part of a Christian to imitate God, you are very much wanting to your duty here. Of God it is written, *Pater noster quies in cœlis*, but you have to say, *Pater noster inquietus in terris*.’ We are not now speaking of such plays upon words as were fashionable in the pulpits of Charles the Second’s time, and in which South and Echard so largely indulged,—things intended rather to display the wit of the writer, than to promote the edification of the hearer; but of witticisms introduced with the honest purpose of doing good, and on the principle of becoming all things to all men. Under this head fall such ingenious contrivances as that of the Spanish bishop, who, having to preach before a crowded and fashionable auditory, perceived, on mounting the pulpit, so drowsy an aspect in his congregation, that there was little hope of his making any impression. Looking, therefore, to that part of the church in which sat the authorities of the Inquisition, he began thus:—‘I deny, and, whatever the Catholic Church may say, I shall always deny, that in the One, self-existent God, there are three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.’ He paused, and, of course, attention was instantly aroused. The bishop of this place looked at the archbishop of that, the officials of the Inquisition turned their heads towards each other, some of the grandees arose, as if about to leave the church, when the preacher quietly continued; ‘Thus, my brethren, speaks the Arian, thus speaks the Sabelian; but we, who have been built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets—’ and so forth. One of Sterne’s sermons begins in the same offensive way. A story is related of a popular dissenting preacher in Wales, who, finding that he had for some time been addressing his congregation to very little purpose, ascended the pulpit one Sunday morning, and, looking around him, said, ‘My brethren, I should like to ask you a question, which you cannot answer, nor I neither. My brethren, what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?’ Saying which, he left the pulpit and the church. This is exactly the thing which some of the more eccentric of mediæval preachers would have done; such, for example, as in Italy, Jacobus de Benedictis, whose familiar appellation of *Jacopone* reveals something of his character; and, to go to a different part of the world, Basil, surnamed *Soroderie*, that is, mad (for Christ’s sake), at Moscow. If there were ever any one who understood how to move and to lead a popular audience, it was Hugh Latimer; and every one knows that his sermons abound with the broadest farce, and teem with expressions which we could not for a moment venture to transfer to our pages. We are, let it be

remembered, neither defending, nor yet condemning, the practices of which we have been speaking; all we say is, that they have been used by the preachers who have been most efficacious, either for good or for evil. Neither can there be any doubt, that English priests, generally, have so reverent a fear of degrading the dignity of the Establishment, of getting off their stilts, of remembering that, after all, they are men speaking to men, of teaching religion as if they really believed in it, that a few examples of an opposite extreme (granting it an extreme) may not have been without their use.

We will take another instance from Vieyra, whom we regard as the more valuable writer, because, while as to time he stands on the debateable ground betwixt the mediæval age and our own, he unites (the reader who is not acquainted with his works may think it impossible) much of the character of S. Jerome on the one hand, and Swift on the other. In occasional turns of thought and collocation of words, Andrewes comes nearer to him than any other English writer; but if Andrewes possesses his piety and his learning, he has not half his wit, nor the tenth part of his eloquence. One of the most curious sermons ever preached, was that which he delivered at Maranhão, a few days before embarking for Portugal on business connected with the missions in Brazil. The whole of that province, and the capital in particular, had sunk into such a frightful state of immorality as, perhaps, was never equalled in any professedly Christian country. Vieyra had crowded audiences, but his sermons, so far as a practical result was concerned, were entirely thrown away. The conceit which runs through the last is about as odd an one as it would be possible to find.

It was S. Antony's day, and the Church of S. Luiz was close to the sea. 'I have long thought,' said the preacher, 'that on the festivals of saints, it is better to preach *like* them, than to preach *of* them. S. Antony addressed himself to the fishes, and so shall I. The church is so near to the sea that they can hear me. And, at all events, I shall have two good qualities in my auditors—they can hear, and they cannot answer. And if,' he continues with bitter irony, 'it be said that fishes are a race who cannot be converted and saved, a preacher in Maranhão must be so much accustomed to that circumstance that it can affect him but little. Therefore, fishes and brethren, I now address myself to you.' He divides his sermon into two parts; the first, containing the praise; the second, the blame of his auditors; every circumstance being selected so as to reflect in the most biting manner on the inhabitants of the city. 'The first thing,' he says, 'which does not edify me, fishes, in your

‘conduct, is, that you devour one another. I confess that you have your excuse in the actions of men. Let a man be in trouble, the solicitor devours him, the solicitor’s clerk devours him, so does the notary, so does the sheriff, so does the advocate, so does the commissioner, so does the judge; he is devoured before he is sentenced. If a man dies, he is devoured by his heirs, by his creditors, by his legatees, by the commissioners of orphans, by the lawyer, by the physician that helped to kill him, by the grave-digger, by the bell-ringer, and by the priest that sings the service; the poor man is not yet in his grave, and he is already devoured.’ Thus he proceeds; and in like manner, while lecturing the fishes for their folly in being taken by a hook, he does not forget to justify them by the hook which the spiritual enemy of man baits for his soul, and by the eagerness with which it is swallowed. Maranhão, in the course of a few years, became a reformed town, but whether the sermon to the fishes were the cause of its reformation, may, perhaps, reasonably be doubted.

It is now time to turn to the third distinguishing feature of mediæval sermons, on which we must dwell a little more at length.

Every one who has studied the ritual and the calendar of the Church, must have speedily convinced himself that its whole aim and design is to be dramatic. It is not the mere reciter of events which happened centuries ago, nor their expounder, nor, as the Puritans would have said, their *improver*; it sets them forth before the eyes of man as if they were now happening; as if they were scenes in which we ourselves were taking a part; as if they were events occurring in our own times, and in which we bore a living interest. The Church would not represent to us the cycle of events in our Lord’s life and death, as if they had occurred once for all eighteen centuries ago; but would have us regard them as if they happened again and again, every year, and were occurrences to which we should look forward rather than look back. This characteristic remains very strongly impressed on our own Prayer-book; where, before each recurring festival, we pray in some sort that the event may happen, as a future thing, which we are really commemorating as a past occurrence. Thus, for example, on the Sunday after Ascension, the Church, as if forgetful that the day of Pentecost is really past, prays, in the very same words that the Apostles might have used during the actual ten days which succeeded our Lord’s ascension, ‘We beseech Thee, leave us not comfortless; but send to us Thine Holy Ghost to comfort us, and exalt us unto the same place whither our Saviour Christ has gone before.’ In the Prayer-books of Protestant Europe this dramatic treat-

ment of the subject is almost universally lost; and it must be confessed that, in one or two instances, our own collects have been, in like manner, rendered tame and prosaic. Never so strikingly as in that for the Fourth Sunday in Advent. The ancient Church, directing her prayer to God the Son, besought Him to appear and to be born for her sake: 'O Lord, raise up, we pray Thee, Thy power, and come among us, and with great might succour us.' We have utterly destroyed the point of the collect by addressing it to the Father, and concluding it, 'through the satisfaction of Thy Son, our Lord.'

What is true, then, of the ritual and office-books of the mediæval Church, is equally true of the sermons which formed a part of it. Here, also, the events which the Church was setting before her children were spoken of as present, or as future; the hearers were not called on, as so often now, to remember that the Church sets before them this, or that the Church would have them to remember that; but whatever it might be, feast or fast, season of joy or season of sorrow, they were taught to feel that the sorrow or the joy was, and ought to be, as real a matter to them, as to those to whom the event had actually first occurred. Open any sermon of that age, and see how the preacher speaks of the subject of the festival, as of something then occurring. Thus it is, for example, that Guar-ric, Abbat of Igniac, begins a sermon in Advent: 'Our King is coming; let us go to meet our Saviour. Well saith Solomon, "As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country." Good news, indeed, which proclaims the advent of a Redeemer, the reconciliation of the world, the good things of the life to come.' There is here no such exordium as we now have; a call to keep in mind the coming of the Saviour, once in great humility, hereafter in great majesty. The preacher plunges his hearers at once into the realization of the fact which the Church commemorates, and announces as good tidings to his audience the same news which so many centuries before had been proclaimed in Bethlehem.

Let us try another discourse of the same Abbat; we will take one on Christmas-day: 'Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given. And thus it is that we know Him to be born, because He is given. For His birth would avail us nothing, unless He were also our own; and He would in vain be made the Son of Man, unless it were given to us to become the sons of God. Behold, how Jesus is offered to us; hasten to meet Him; stretch forth your hands, make ready your affections, prove your devotion by acts as well as words.'

Now compare this with the opening of modern sermons on the same subject. Thus it is that Bishop Horsley commences a

Christmas sermon : ‘ This forty-fifth Psalm has, for many ages, made a stated part of the public service of the Church, on this anniversary festival of our blessed Lord’s Nativity. With God’s assistance, I purpose to explain to you its application, both in the general subject, and in each particular part, to this great occasion, which will afford both seasonable and edifying matter of discourse.’ With Bishop Horsley, then, the Nativity is regarded as an event which occurred many centuries ago, in order that it might be ‘ improved ’ and made matter of edifying discourse now ; with Abbat Guarrie it is a present reality ; as present to himself as to the shepherds to whom the angels first announced the glad tidings of great joy which should be to all people. We turn to another sermon on the same subject, and there we find the mediæval author expressly disclaiming the system of the modern divine. ‘ Ye have come together, brethren, to hear the word of God. But God has provided some better thing for you. To-day ye shall not only hear, but ye shall also see that Word, if ye will but go with me to Bethlehem and behold this thing which the Lord hath told and hath manifested to us. For God knoweth that the senses of men are incapable of things invisible, and hardly to be taught things celestial, and are not without difficulty to be persuaded to believe, unless the thing which they are exhorted to believe be visibly presented to their senses.’ But we, so far from remembering this difficulty of faith, do all that in us lies to render it yet harder. We studiously inculcate the fact that the event of which we are preaching is a history of the past, not an action of the present.

It is curious to observe how the mediæval system is by degrees softened and tamed down into the present. The divines of the early part of the seventeenth century have retained much of the reality and effectiveness of earlier times. Thus it is that Bishop Cosin begins a sermon on the Epiphany : ‘ We are still at the feast of Christmas, and this is the last and great day of the feast, as S. John said of another. A feast of joy it has been all this while, but this day was given us that our joy might be full.’ So Bishop Andrewes : ‘ Christ was born, is true any day ; but this day Christ was born, never but to-day only. For of no day in the year can it be said, *hodie natus*, but of this. By which word the Holy Ghost may seem to have marked it out and made it the peculiar text of the day.’ Or again : ‘ Here is joy, joy at a sight, at the sight of a day, and that day Christ’s. It is Christ that calleth it here *diem Meum*, *His day* ; and no day so properly His, as His birthday. So the text comes full upon the day.’ These beginnings, if not reaching the full realization of the festival which we find in

earlier writers, are, at least, incomparably superior to the eighteenth century system of exordium. We sink a little towards it in Dr. Donne. Thus he begins a Christmas sermon: 'It hath been suspiciously doubted, and more than that, freely disputed, and more than that too, absolutely denied, that Christ was born the five-and-twentieth of December; that this is Christmas Day; yet, for all these doubts, and disputations, and denials, we forbear not, with the whole Church of God, constantly and confidently to keep this for His day.' And so, by degrees, we come down to the ordinary and common-place method of opening: 'The words which I have read you form a part of the Lesson which the Church,' &c. &c.

Let us try a Passion sermon or two, and see how the different schools of divines treat it. Thus it is that Peter de Celles commences one: 'Behold, beloved brethren, Jesus Christ is being led before your eyes to be put to death; what will ye say, or what will ye do? Behold, there is none of all His friends to console Him; all have forsaken Him and fled. Thou, O Jesu, alone for us, yet without us, bearest the burden and heat of the day, bearest the crown of thorns, bearest the Cross, bearest Thy Blood within the veil of the sanctuary, bearest our sins in Thy Body on the Tree of the Cross, bearest the fire and the wood, that the fire of Thy Passion may consume the wood of our sins.' Or again: 'We have been following the footsteps of Christ, beloved brethren, and have now come to His Passion. God grant that, not even in His Passion departing from Him, we may wait with Peter to see the end, so that without end we may enjoy fellowship with Him. Look, therefore, good Christian, at the steps in which He set His feet, and which are marked with His Blood, so that thy foot may also be dyed in the Blood of the Lamb.' Or take another instance, and hear S. Fulbert of Chartres, in one of his Passion sermons: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Great Physician, is now preparing the medicine that is to be the salvation of our souls. Wherefore, Christian brethren, it behoves us to receive that which He is now mixing and is now giving. He reaches forth the cup of our salvation, and we must stretch forth our hands and receive it.'

Look, now, to our own earlier divines. Bishop Andrewes, preaching on the verse, 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?' begins: 'At the very hearing or reading of which there is none but will presently conceive it is the voice of a party in great extremity. In great extremity two ways; first, in such distress as never was any, if ever there was sorrow like my sorrow; and then, in that distress, having none to regard him, "Is it nothing to you?"' Bishop Wilson degenerates into

this commencement: 'Every one of the Apostles and Evangelists who have written our Lord's Life, have given us a very particular account of the manner of His evil treatment, His sufferings, and His death. Now these are all read in the daily service of this week, as full of instruction, and proper to prepare us for the Blessed Sacrament, appointed to be administered on Sunday next.' (Imagine Easter Day being principally distinguished as the Sunday on which the Blessed Sacrament was appointed to be administered!) 'Whereby we learn what our Lord suffered in order to obtain our pardon, and to restore us to the grace and mercy of an offended God.' And at last we come down to such a kind of opening as is that of Joseph Milner: 'The words which I have now read to you contain the portion of Scripture appointed by our Church for the Epistle on Easter Day. And, perhaps, there is not a portion of the Word of God more suitably adapted to the occasion of that festival; so deeply and so powerfully does it represent to us the right use and proper improvement of our Lord's Resurrection. This great event is of vast importance.' Or take the following from Paley: 'The salvation of mankind, and most particularly in so far as the death and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ are concerned in it, and whereby He comes to be called our Saviour and our Redeemer, ever has been, and ever must be, a most interesting subject to all serious minds.'

But bad and shocking to every right feeling as is such an exordium, the method of treating the subject which was prevalent in the last century was, by many degrees, worse. Nor is it quite obsolete among us now. We were once spending a Sunday in Lent in a country parish, where the clergyman was of the old school, and not a bad specimen of it. In the morning he requested us to preach, with a special injunction to be as plain and simple as possible, 'because,' said he, 'my people are very ignorant, and require the most elementary teaching.' Accordingly, we endeavoured to comply with his wishes, and hoped that, in some degree, we had succeeded. 'It was not so bad,' said our friend, as we walked home from church, 'but still not quite so plain as I could have wished. If you will listen to me in the afternoon, I will endeavour to show you the way in which I think that such a congregation ought to be addressed.' After such an invitation, when the worthy rector ascended the pulpit, we were—as the saying is—all attention, and heard him begin, nearly word for word, in the following manner: 'To those who will consider the harmony which reigns in the various accounts dictated by inspiration of Christ's Passion, confirmed as those accounts are by the antecedent testimonies of Prophets on the one hand, and by the

‘concurrent testimonies of the Epistles on the other, it will appear in the highest degree probable, that our Blessed Lord was not an impostor, but was, in reality, what He gave Himself out to be, the Son of God.’

Now there can be no doubt that there was some excuse for this style of preaching in the last century. When the state of religious, or rather of irreligious, feeling was such that a divine, by no means disposed to take a gloomy view of things, could say, ‘It seems to be now generally assumed by mankind that the Christian religion is an imposition which it was left to this age to expose,’ it might be necessary, even on the highest festival, to say something in proof of the fact before anything was added of a more edifying nature. He that cometh to God must believe that He is, before he can believe anything further with regard to His doings. And so in a fashionable congregation, as it was a hundred years ago, when Archbishop Potter, or Bishop Lavington, or Archdeacon Paley, or Dr. Jortin was to preach, when the pews of the then new church of S. George’s, Bloomsbury, or the still aristocratic place of worship at S. Martin’s-in-the-Fields, were crowded to excess, and ladies were obliged to slide their hoops over one shoulder in order to make room, just at the time when Lord Chesterfield was going out of fashion, and Dr. Blair was coming in, it might be necessary to prove to the worshippers on an Easter-day, or a Whit-Sunday, that the Resurrection was not altogether incredible, and that the Descent of the Holy Ghost was within the bounds of possibility. For we must never forget that, however lowering and debasing was this constant struggle against infidelity, however much it might be impossible to touch pitch without being defiled, (so that Douglas, the defender of scripture miracles, based his argument on a foundation which destroyed all others, and even Leslie’s celebrated criterion of their truth defends only one not recorded in the Bible, still the work which the Church of England then had to do, to defend revelation, was done, and was done effectually. If we compare the state of the French and English Churches at the beginning and at the conclusion of the eighteenth century, we shall find that with all her great preachers, her Massillons, and her Bossuets, and her Bourdaloues, the former failed, where the latter, through the mercy of God, succeeded. But that what the miserable condition of the last century rendered necessary should be carried on by a dry tradition into this,—that every festival should be made a lesson in evidences, and seasons of the highest joy ushered in by a decoction of Paley or Lardner, is a disgrace from which we ought more thoroughly to have freed ourselves than is, at present, the case.

We have said something of the subjects, and of the manner of

treating these subjects, which occupy mediæval sermons and our own. Let us now turn our attention to the order in which, in both instances, the parts of a sermon follow each other.

One would think, to read some of the essays written on the subject, that the construction of a sermon was like a law of the Medes and Persians. Look at Mr. Simeon's one-and-twenty tedious volumes of '*Horæ Homileticæ*.' The worthy man evidently considered this the greatest system of divinity which English theology had ever produced. And of what does it consist? Of several thousand sermons treated exactly in the same ways, in obedience to precisely the same laws, and of much about the same length. Claude's essay had laid down certain rules, and Simeon's discourses were their exemplification. The laws were as invariable for the pulpit as was Dr. Watts's recipe for a prayer:—

'Call upon God: adore: confess:
Petition: plead: and then declare
You are the Lord's: give thanks and bless:
And let Amen conclude the prayer.'

In like manner Mr. Simeon's type of sermons may be very easily described. The preacher opens with a short view of the circumstances under which the text was spoken. This is a very convenient exordium, because it fills two or three pages with but little trouble. The clergyman has only to put scripture language into his own, and he is fairly launched in his sermon without any effort. Another almost equally easy method of opening is found in drawing a contrast between the person or thing of which the passage in hand speaks and that to which the writer may wish to allude. And it has this special advantage; that if he is unlucky in finding much likeness between the two, he is sure to discover a good deal of *unlikeness*, and either treatment will supply a good number of words. Then, as every one knows, come the heads,—a most important part in this style of discourse. Taking Mr. Simeon as a pattern, we shall find that they cannot be less than two nor more than four; though, indeed, there are not wanting those who have greatly extravagated beyond the superior limit, as the Puritan divine's 'And now, to be brief, I would observe eighteenthly, that—' so and so, may suffice to prove. Then come all the minutiae of subdivisions, and under-subdivisions, (little heads, as the charity children call them,) all set forth, when the aforesaid discourses come to be printed, in corresponding variations of type. Thus, we have first of all a noble looking Roman numeral, in this manner, I. Next to this will come a more modest 1. The preacher's subject ramifies; in order to keep his skeins clear, he takes refuge in a (1). Again they become entangled, and this

time he betakes himself to a [1]. The congregation admire the scriptural knowledge and the logical depth of their divine; and thus encouraged, he proceeds to a still more minute handling of his subject, and gets down to a *Firstly*. We remember being condemned, when a child, to read day after day the Commentary of Matthew Henry, who, above all other writers, delights in thus multiplying subdivisions. And we well recollect that the single point of interest which his lucubrations afforded us, arose from the mental discussion of a philosophical question connected with them. Suppose, we argued, that the writer wished, after the last subdivision to which we have referred, to divide his topic again, in what kind of type would that division be expressed? So much for the heads.

And then comes the application; varied, it may be, in words, but pretty much the same in meaning. The preacher first addresses 'the unregenerate,' and next 'the regenerate;' or, firstly, the 'unconverted,' and secondly, the 'converted;' unless, indeed, he should prefer to imitate the Irish clergyman, who, on occasion of some state fast, addressed himself, in the first place, to those who evinced their respect to constituted authorities by attending church on that day, and, in the next place, to those who showed their disrespect to the government by staying away.

Thus, we think, we have given a fair view of a Claudian or Simeonian sermon, the great difficulty in which seems to be the drawing to an end. The servant's excuse is no caricature, (as those who have sat under such discourses can well testify,) who, when blamed for bringing the carriage to the door of a fashionable chapel in London twenty minutes before the sermon was over, defended himself by the assertion that he had waited until he had heard the preacher say at short intervals, 'Lastly,' 'Finally,' 'Not to be tedious,' 'In fine,' 'And to conclude,' and had then ventured to think that he might come away.

Now let us see in what way it was that the older writers managed their divisions. To make ourselves more intelligible, we will take the liberty of applying a passage in a sermon of John Newton's to the matter in hand. Preaching against the Oratorio of the 'Messiah,' he says—

'I represent to myself a number of persons of various characters involved in one common charge of high treason. There is not the least doubt of their guilt being fully proved, and that nothing but a pardon can preserve them from punishment. Entirely regardless of their danger, they are wholly taken up with contriving methods of amusing themselves. Among other resources, they call in the assistance of music; and amidst a great variety of subjects in this way, they are particularly pleased with one. They choose to make the solemnities of their impending trial the groundwork of a musical entertainment. The king, however, undesired by them,

sends them a gracious message, and, in a way which he condescends to prescribe, he offers them a free and a full pardon. But, instead of taking a single step towards a compliance with his goodness, they set this message likewise to music, and it is sung for their diversion.'

With a great deal more truth one might ask a question which would have occasioned the worthy Rector of S. Mary Woolnoth some little surprise. Is it possible that they, knowing, or, at least, pretending to know, more than others, the office of a Christian priest in reference to men under such a condemnation as that to which the extract refers,—is it possible that they could desire to cramp down his message here, to pare it off there, to elongate or to abbreviate it as if its value depended on its inches, to split it up into so many bundles of facts, to make an introduction and an application essential points, instead of leaving him to speak out of the fulness of his heart, to be interesting in his own way, and to give God's message in as natural a manner as he would deliver one of his own? The wonder is, that so many men, whom one cannot doubt to be really in earnest, should sit down Saturday after Saturday to compound from the 'Horæ Homileticæ' the discourse which they propose to inflict next day on their parishioners. The flatness, and tameness, and insipidity of such a sermon, let its source be eloquence and fervour itself, could hardly be paralleled. Its issue must be of the same kind with the *thorough-paced doctrine* of Bishop Sprat. When that honest man, but miserable divine and poet, was examined before the Privy Council on the charge of complicity with Bishop Atterbury's so-called plot, a paper was taken from his person and considered highly suspicious by the lawyers, which contained these words: 'Doctor Burgess—thorough-paced doctrine.' 'If I must explain,' said he, when pressed as to the meaning of these mysterious symbols, 'the facts are these. I am ashamed to say that once, when a young man, I had the curiosity to attend Dr. Burgess's then celebrated meeting-house. Speaking of thorough-paced doctrine, he said that he would define it for the benefit of his hearers; "it is that doctrine," he continued, "which goes in at one ear, and goes out of the other."' And in Dr. Burgess's sense we may safely affirm the sermons of which we have been speaking to be peculiarly thorough-paced.

It is remarkable in how few sermons, either of the early or the middle ages, is there any division at all analogous to that of modern Heads. In S. Ambrose or S. Augustine such a thing is scarcely to be found. In the seventh and eighth centuries, such writers as S. Isidore and the French school of divines sometimes divided their discourses in a more set or formal manner; but no great preacher appears to have been much given to the system,

with the single exception of S. Antony of Padua, whose compositions, as we now have them, are little more than a bundle of heads, and could only have been preserved from dryness by length. Take, for example, the commencement of one on the 4th Sunday after Trinity. The text is, 'Be ye also merciful, as your Father which is in heaven is merciful.'

'Four things,' he says, 'are here to be noted. Firstly, the affluence of goodness which we ought to imitate; in these words, *Be ye merciful*. Secondly, the opulence of celestial felicity on which we ought to meditate: *good measure*. Thirdly, the misery of internal blindness, which we ought to avoid: *How can the blind lead the blind?* Fourthly, the craftiness of fraternal pravity, against which we ought to guard: *Why beholdest thou the mote?* In this first head are five remarkable points: to have pity; not to judge; not to condemn; to forgive, and to give. . . . And notice, that as the mercy of the FATHER is threefold towards thee, so thine must be threefold towards thy neighbour. The mercy of the FATHER is specious, spacious, and precious; thy mercy also must be threefold. If thy neighbour have offended thee, forgive him; if he have erred from the way of truth, instruct him; if he be an hungered, refresh him.'

This may serve as another proof of what we have already asserted, that S. Antony never could have delivered such bony things as this extract to a common congregation; but either they were simply heads for his own use, or for the employment of his brethren, for whose benefit he was compelled to publish his sermons. Yet even in the midst of these innumerable subdivisions, he brings in another illustration like those to which we have already referred, which would naturally take with a country congregation in Italy.

'Let us, therefore, be merciful, and imitate the cranes, who, when they set off for their appointed place, fly up to some lofty eminence, in order that they may obtain a view of the lands which they are going to pass. The leader of the band goes before them, chastises those that fly too slowly, and keeps together the troop by his cry. As soon as he becomes hoarse, another takes his place; and all have the same care for those that are weary; so that, if any one is unable to fly, the rest gather together, and bear him up till he recovers his strength. Nor do they take less care of each other when they are on the ground. They divide the night into watches, so that there may be a vigilant care over all. Those that watch hold a weight in one of their claws, so that, if they happen to sleep, it falls on the ground and makes a noise, and thus convicts them of somnolency. . . . Let us, therefore, be merciful as the cranes; that, placing ourselves on a lofty watch-tower in this life, we may look out both for ourselves and for others, may lead those that are ignorant of the way, and may chastise the slothful and negligent by our exhortations. Let us succeed alternately to labour. Let us carry the weak and infirm, that they faint not in the way. In the watches of the night, let us keep vigil to the Lord, by prayer and contemplation.'

And so he again returns to the thread of his discourse.

One might arrange mediæval methods of dividing sermons into three classes. The first, that in which there is *bonâ fide* one text, worked out without reference to the context; the second,

where the whole context is taken as one subject, and not in separate and successive parts, which is the method usually employed by S. Antony, and recommended by S. Charles Borromeo; the third, when the gospel or epistle is treated by way of postill or homily, one verse after the other, till the whole is gone through. And this was the favourite practice of French theologians, such as S. Hildebert, Marbod, S. Fulbert, and their contemporaries, but carried out more perfectly by none than by Rupert of Deutz, whose commentaries *De Gloria et Honore Filii Hominis*, *De Operibus Spiritus Sancti*, and *De Trinitate et Operibus ejus*, are perfect models in their way.

It is worth while to notice how the preachers of whom we are speaking almost intuitively followed S. Augustine's rule as to their style.

'Et tamen cum concinnator debeat rerum doctor esse magnarum, non semper eas debet granditer dicere, sed submissè cum aliquid docetur; temperatè, cum aliquid vituperatur sive laudatur: cum vero aliquid agendum est, et ad eos loquimur qui hoc agere debent, nec tamen volunt, tunc ea quæ magna sunt, dicenda sunt granditer et ad flectendos animos congruenter. Et aliquando de unâ eâdemque re magnâ, et submissè dicitur, si docetur; et temperatè, si predicatur; et granditer, si aversus inde animus ut convertatur impellitur. Quid enim Deo ipso majus est? Numquid ideo non discitur? Aut qui docet unitatem Trinitatis debet nisi submissâ disputatione agere, ut res ad dignoscendum difficilis, quantum datur, possit intelligi? Numquid hic ornamenta et non documenta quærantur? Porro cum laudatur Deus sive de se ipso sive de operibus suis, quanta facies pulcræ ac splendidæ dictionibus obnuitur ei, qui potest quantum potest laudare; Quem nemo convenienter laudat, nemo quomodocumque non laudat.'

It is to the ornate style, as it used to be called, that Vieyra alludes, amusingly enough:—

'Is it possible,' he says, 'that we are Portuguese, and hear a preacher speaking in Portuguese, and cannot understand what he says? Just as there is a Lexicon for Greek, and a Calepinus for Latin, so it is necessary to have a vocabulary for the pulpit. I could wish, at all events, that our preachers would be intelligible in their proper names; for they in their ornateness have re-baptized the saints, and every author whom they allege is an enigma. Thus, they speak of the *Penitent Sceptre*; thus, they speak of the *Evangelistic Apelles*; thus, of the *Eagle of Africa*; thus, of the *Honeycomb of Clairvaux*, of the *Purple of Bethlehem*, of the *Mouth of Gold*. Do you call this quoting? They say that the Penitent Sceptre means David; the Evangelistic Apelles, S. Luke; the Honeycomb of Clairvaux, S. Bernard; the Eagle of Africa, S. Augustine; the Purple of Bethlehem, S. Jerome; the Mouth of Gold, S. Chrysostom. But a man might take it the other way, and believe that the Purple of Bethlehem was Herod; the Eagle of Africa, Scipio; the Mouth of Gold, Midas. If an advocate were thus to quote Bartholus or Baldus, would you trust your cause in his hands? If a man were thus to speak in conversation, would you not set him down as a fool? That, then, which is folly in ordinary life, why should it be wisdom in the pulpit?'

We are reminded of an anecdote of that great critic in sermons, Charles Simeon, to whom we have so often referred.

A young composer of sermons was reading a discourse, for the purpose of obtaining the approbation of the author of the '*Horæ Homileticæ*.' At length he reached the following passage: 'Amidst the tumult and ecstasy of the children of Israel, the son of Amram stood unmoved.' 'The son of Amram!' interrupted Simeon; 'the son of Amram! who was he?' 'Why, Sir, I meant Moses.' 'Then,' thundered the critic, 'if you *meant* Moses, why not *say* Moses?' But we trust that common sense has very nearly banished this style of preaching from our pulpits. It is too true that the Clergy still preach far above the heads of their country congregations; but it is from carelessness or from hurry, and not because they think it a mark of excellence, as the ornate school did, to be unintelligible.

We had intended to offer some other remarks on the subject which we have been considering; but we are compelled by our limits to forego that design. We shall only say a word or two on one peculiar class of sermons, to which we have not yet referred; those preached at Visitations or before Synods. If till within the last twenty years we have gone on flattering ourselves that the Church of England was the very pattern and quintessence of apostolic purity, and that in so far as any other communion differed from it, so far it was at variance with the perfect model, there is now some little fear lest a few among us should run into the opposite extreme, and imagine that never was any Church at such a distance from primitive excellence, nor so utterly infected with corruption. To any one who entertains these opinions we would recommend a prescription, which should not involve any great degree of trouble, and which may have other advantages besides the specific one for which we would advise its adoption. We would prescribe a course of sermons, say of the eleventh or twelfth centuries, delivered to Synods, whether diocesan or provincial. It is curious to see how the same complaints have been made, in all ages, of remissness in supporting the faith, of negligence in the cure of souls, of degeneracy from primitive times. S. Hildebert, in addressing the Clergy of Angers or Tours; S. Fulbert, in his Diocesan Synods of Chartres; S. Norbert, preaching before the priests of Magdeburg; S. Anselm, in Normandy and at Canterbury; S. Arnoul at Soissons; S. Frederick at Utrecht: all bear witness to the same thing. True, it is with no uncertain sound that those Charges for the most part spoke. They were not quite of the same kind with that of a clergyman who preached a Visitation sermon before Bishop North of Winchester, and chose for his subject, The Existence of a God. When it was afterwards gently hinted by some of his brethren that he might have chosen a more edifying topic, 'Why,' said he, 'to tell you

‘the truth, it was the only subject of which I could think, on which we were likely to be agreed.’

Every one will remember the idea which, as Pugin tells us, he had at first formed of those middle ages: ‘holy priests, holy monks, happy people, holy everybody.’ It is, therefore, not without its value to see what sort of things were sermons addressed to the Clergy at a time when the discipline of the English Church was such as the famous ballad of the Abbat of Gloucester shows it to have been:—

‘Hoc est meum consulatis,
Quod utrumque deponatis,—
Et Prioris et Abbatis
Ad sua piloria.

‘Absit, dicit alter clerus,
Quia bibit parum merus,
Quod punitur tam severus
Per noster consortia:

‘Esset enim hoc riotus,
Quod pro stultus horum potus
Sustineret clerus totus
Pudor et scandalia.’

Thus it is that Peter of Blois speaks to the Clergy of that era:—

‘O, how dreadful, how dangerous a thing, my brethren, is the administration of your office! Ye are held to answer, not only for yourselves, but for the souls of those that are committed to you in the day of tremendous judgment; and how shall he keep another man’s conscience who cannot keep his own? For conscience is an inscrutable abyss, a most obscure night; and yet it is this night in which that miserable priest is concerned, and about which he is occupied. “Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?” What will that priest do who feels himself loaded with sins, involved in cares, infected with the vileness of carnal desires, blind, bowed down, infirm, pressed with a thousand difficulties, struggling against a thousand necessities, troubled with a thousand doubts, propense to vice, weak to virtue? What will he do, the son of grief, the son of eternal despair, who neither kindles in himself nor in others the fire of charity? Surely, he is prepared to be the food for the consumption of fire.’

Many are the thrilling passages which those old writers have when they are addressing their brother clergy; and many a lesson is to be learnt from such discourses, both curious historically, and interesting practically. He would surely not be mispending his time, who would give an edition of some of the discourses *ad Clerum* of English divines, from Lanfranc to Warham, tracing the gradual corruption of discipline, the gradual rise of heresy, the fuller and fuller development of worldliness, the signs of the gathering storm, as early as the age of Henry V., the disregard shown of its warnings, and the final crash.

Many and many a curious complaint, singularly like some of those of the present day, would thus be brought to light; many and many such a passage as the following in Peter of Blois, which reads like a mediævalised extract from the weekly newspapers of the present day, whose editors and contributors only seem to go to church for the express purpose of finding fault with the services and sermons of their friends, by way of conciliating their enemies.

‘There are some,’ says the Archdeacon, ‘who when they have begun a verse, think the time endless, till they can get to its close; and so run the words one into another in their hurry, that in the honeycomb of the law remains neither wax nor honey. They gulp down a whole verse in one breath, and so gallop through the Lord’s song, that they cut it down to half its length by clipping its words; their lips are in the chant, but their hearts in the platter.’ And so in another place he says, ‘“Let all those that seek Thee be joyful and glad in Thee;” but those are not glad in God who make such inordinate clippings and slurrings, nor are clippings of this kind acceptable to the Lord.’

We have thus noted a few of the most striking characteristics of mediæval sermons. Would that we could induce any of our brethren to try for themselves whether, by a little study of the writers whom Andrewes, and Donne, and Cosin, had in their hearts and in their memories, their own discourses would not be improved; whether that which is now so often a grievous task, the making or repatching of the Saturday’s sermons, would not become a profit and a pleasure, if they would but be at the trouble of first reading over what such authors as Rupert of Deutz, or Hugh of S. Victor, or Rhabanus Maurus, or, far greater than all, S. Bernard, have said on the same text! It is useless to recommend, for general use, so large and expensive a work as the *Bibliotheca Patrum Concionatoria* of Caubefis. But he that should have mastered that, would be stocked with the knowledge, and he that could be imbued with the spirit of the *Rhetorica Sacra* of Luiz de Granada, the masterwork on the subject, would be kindled into the spirit, of well-nigh a perfect preacher.

ART. II.—1. *Analysis of the Evidence given before a Select Committee of the House of Lords, and a Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed during the Session 1852, to inquire into the Operation of the Act 3 and 4 Will. IV. cap. 85. for the better Government of Her Majesty's Indian Territories.* London: 1853. [Printed for the East India Company.]

2. *Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords. [Brought from the Lords and ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, June 16, 1853. No. 627. I.]*

3. *Sixth Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons. [Ordered to be Printed, Aug. 8, 1853. No. 897.]*

4. *An Act to Provide for the Government of India, (August 20, 1853,) 16 & 17 Vict. cap. 95.*

ON no former occasion have the political privileges of the East India Company been renewed with so little discussion on the state and prospects of the Church within the extensive territories entrusted to their administration, as during the progress of the East India Bill. Select Committees were appointed by both Houses of Parliament in 1852, to inquire into the whole operation of the Act of 1833, which, among other ecclesiastical provisions, enacted the erection of episcopal Sees at Madras and Bombay. The inquiry was divided under eight heads, the seventh of which was entitled 'Ecclesiastical Provision for the Diffusion of Christian Spiritual Instruction;' but the close of the session found neither Committee advanced beyond the first division: and the Bill for prolonging the Company's government was introduced in 1853. As this measure related exclusively to the single division of the inquiry which had been sufficiently investigated, described as 'The Authorities and Agencies for administering the Government of India at Home and in India respectively,' it seems to have been intended that other Bills should follow on the remaining branches, when ripe for legislation. On former occasions the Company's administration was renewed for a specific term of years, and at each renewal Parliament annexed its conditions to the lease, remaining content with its bargain till the expiry of the period. This was a clumsy kind of legislation, but, like the system of ecclesiastical leases, not without some advantages at a time when corruption and the spirit of party ran so high in the legislature, that a distant province could only be kept safe by removing it

beyond the reach of mischievous interference. In the present Act no term of years is fixed, and Parliament is understood to have reserved the power of introducing at any time such amendments and additions as appear to be necessary. The Committees proceeding at the same time with the other seven branches of the inquiry, suggested of course the expectation of further legislation at least upon these important subjects.

This mode of proceeding, in itself perhaps more dignified than the other, was no doubt highly convenient both to the Queen's Government and the Court of Directors. It saved a world of trouble and discussion, while securing the point of chief importance to the administration. The authorities of Canon-row and Leadenhall-street, preserving a decent appearance of their traditional antagonism, yet softened towards each other so far that the Board of Control raised the nominal stipends of the Directors to the respectable salaries of 1,000*l.* and 500*l.* per annum, while Sir James Hogg, the Company's parliamentary Coryphæus, reciprocated the compliment by proposing and carrying the sum of 5,000*l.* for the President of the Board of Control. The House and the public meanwhile looked on quietly, not to say apathetically, and the *first* Act for the Government of India is now in operation.

We hear nothing, however, of the *second* or the *third*, and our doubt is, how far, after the Home and Indian Governments have got rid of the pressure on themselves, they will be inclined to bestow their attention on questions which have lost the opportunity of compelling a settlement. With some anxiety on this point, we propose in the present article to discuss that branch of the inquiry which naturally possesses the chief interest for our readers.

The condition of the English Church in India is completely *sui generis*. Nothing exactly like it exists either at home or in any of our Colonial Dioceses, and we shall endeavour in the first place to establish a true notion of the systems in actual operation.

There are in India three distinct organizations comprised under the name of the Church of England. 1. *The Government Ecclesiastical Establishments*; 2. *The Missions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*; and, 3. *Those of the Church Missionary Society*. Each exhibits some features of the Church, and doubtless embodies a genuine ecclesiastical idea. But having grown up by accident more than from design, neither fully realizes its own mission, while the combination which constitutes a flourishing Church is altogether wanting.

The Government Ecclesiastical Establishment is stated in a return delivered to the House of Commons (Sixth Report,

Appx. No. 6) to consist of three bishops, three archdeacons, (who are also chaplains), and 122 chaplains and assistant-chaplains, who (with the exception of one in each Presidency, selected by the Bishop for his domestic chaplain) officiate at the different civil and military stations.

The archdeacons are appointed by the bishops, receiving an additional allowance of 300*l.* a-year, but retaining the duties as well as the emoluments of their respective chaplaincies. The bishoprics are in the patronage of the President of the Board of Control, and the assistant chaplaincies in that of the Directors, the 'assistants' rising to be 'chaplains' by seniority.

The salaries are nearly as follows:—

Bishop of Calcutta (Metropolitan)	<i>per annum</i>	£5,000
„ Madras	„	2,500
„ Bombay	„	2,500
Senior Presidency Chaplain		1,200
Junior		980
Chaplains (in Bengal)		960
„ in Madras and Bombay		840
Assistant-Chaplains		600

Additional allowances on a liberal scale are made to the bishops to cover the expenses of their Visitations, and also to the chaplains when travelling on duty. Retiring pensions are provided, for the Bishop of Calcutta after ten years' service in India, and for the Bishops of Madras and Bombay after fifteen; previous service as archdeacon being reckoned in the period. The chaplains also enjoy retiring pensions after fifteen years' Indian service, with proportionate allowances while on furlough or sick leave, and half-pay if compelled by a failure of health to retire before the period of pension.

The origin of this Establishment is coeval with the Company itself; the following being extracted from the Charter of Incorporation, dated 22d July, 1702.

'And Her Majesty's further will and pleasure is, and she doth hereby direct and appoint, that the said English Company and their successors according to the provision made in that behalf in their said Charter of 5th September, in the tenth year of his said late Majesty's reign, shall constantly maintain . . . one Protestant minister in every garrison and superior factory which the same Company or their successors shall have in the East Indies, or other parts within the limits aforesaid; and shall also in such garrisons and factories respectively provide, or set apart, a decent and convenient place for Divine Service only; . . . and, moreover, that no such minister shall be sent by the same Company to the said East Indies, or other the parts within the limits aforesaid, until he shall have been first approved of by the Archbishop of Canterbury or Bishop of London for the time being; and Her Majesty doth hereby further will and appoint that all such ministers as shall be sent as aforesaid to reside in India, or other the

parts within the limits aforesaid, be obliged to learn, within one year after their arrival, the *Portuguese language*; and shall apply themselves to learn the native language of the country where they shall reside, the better to enable them to instruct the *Gentoos*, that shall be servants or slaves of the same Company or of their agents, in the Protestant religion; and, further, that the said English Company, and their successors, shall, from time to time, provide schoolmasters in all the said garrisons and superior factories where they shall be found necessary.'

At the time this Charter was granted the Company possessed in India only a few commercial factories, and not a single British soldier had as yet set foot upon its soil. Their chaplains were therefore plainly intended for the spiritual instruction of the *Natives*, and we believe that the regiments first sent out by the Crown took their own military chaplains with them. This practice, however, was speedily discontinued. The care of the soldiery was thrown upon the Company's chaplains, who in consequence came to be considered as appointed exclusively for that purpose. All 'interference with the religion of the Natives,' that is, all attempts at the propagation of Christianity, were vehemently condemned by a Government which took the Pagodas under their immediate patronage, and made a very good thing of the management of 'Church Lands,' formerly wasted by unprincipled Brahmins.

At present the Court of Directors, as we learn from their secretary,¹

'have laid it down as a principle, that the religious benefit of the servants of Government is the *only* ground upon which an ecclesiastical establishment can be maintained at the charge of the Indian revenue. Conversion, they think, should not be carried on through Government agency; any attempt of the kind, it is believed, would retard the progress of Christianity; in which their opinion coincides with that of Bishop Heber.'—*Analysis*, p. 121.

We must not here stay to remark on the ingenuity which would cover the Company's former undisguised resistance—and its present too-evident disinclination—to Missionary operations,² with the cloak of a righteous zeal for the purity of the Gospel. We remember the opposition to the erection of the See of Calcutta, and the predictions then made of the disorder and rebellion to be introduced among the 'gentle Hindoos' by the 'fanatical' attempts to convert them to Christianity. We cannot quite forget that Bishop Middleton was smuggled on shore without the usual marks of respect, for fear of exciting the Natives; and there is an ugly story somewhere, of a

¹ The Company's 'Charter' has been twice carried through Parliament by this distinguished officer, the most able of a remarkably able family. The civil riband of K.C.B. attests rather than rewards his labours on the late occasion.

² 'If I were not afraid of having my expression misunderstood, I should say there is more than indifference; the Government rather lean against the missionaries.'—*Rev. W. Keane, Lords' Second Report, Qu. 7,892.*

chaplain being warmly reprimanded for baptizing a sepoy. But let bygones be bygones. The principle laid down by Sir J. C. Melvill is now undoubtedly generally accepted; though we must be allowed to remark that the obligation laid upon the Company in its original charter having been no way abrogated in any of the subsequent renewals of its political or commercial privileges, cannot be repudiated so easily as they seem to think.

In the disposal of their chaplains—

‘it has been the principle of the Government to provide, in the first place, for those stations where there are regular European troops; after these are supplied, the Presidency towns (Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay), where large numbers of Protestants in the service of Government are congregated, are considered to have the first claim in the allotment of Chaplains, and those which then remain¹ are placed at the discretion of Government, in communication with the bishop, at those stations where there may be the greatest number of civil and military officers.’—*Commons' Sixth Report*, 1853, *Qn.* 10,012.

Smaller stations are visited periodically by the Chaplains from the principal station most conveniently situated for the purpose. This ‘convenience’ may be appreciated when we state that ‘the District’ assigned to a friend of our own consisted of a Native State as large as Ireland, containing five ‘out stations,’ the nearest of which was 30 miles from his residence, and the furthest 120. Archdeacon Shortland speaks of districts still larger, but as a general rule 100 miles is considered the furthest limit at which a Chaplain should be called upon to extend his ministrations. In making his annual circuit our friend travelled considerably above a thousand miles, in a country which has neither railways nor turnpike roads, but mere tracks, over most of which the horse or the palanquin forms the only means of conveyance. During his absence the principal station was left to the other Chaplain (when it had another), or else was unserved. Yet that the district duty could not be neglected is evident, from the fact that as many Communicants at the Holy Eucharist were mustered among these scattered companies as in the large station itself.

Such is the Government Establishment, so far as the Church of England is concerned. Two chaplains of the Kirk of Scotland are maintained at each Presidency, on exactly the same footing, and four Bishops of the Church of Rome receive each a stipend of 240*l.* a-year, for ‘superintending’ the clergy officiating to the Roman Catholic soldiery. In the appointment of these Romish ‘chaplains,’ (as they are self-styled,) the Govern-

¹ ‘This is hardly correct; the churches at the Presidencies are supplied *before* any others. A friend of ours was kept officiating in one for some time, while two military stations to which he was successively appointed remained unsupplied,

ment does not interfere, but certain small allowances are made to them through their bishops.¹

These establishments are regarded as forming the Ecclesiastical department of the Government Service. Rank and precedence 'in the Service' are allotted to the Bishops, Archdeacons, and Chaplains. Not only the erection and repairs of their churches, but every expense of Divine Service, down to washing the surplices, and even paying for the Sacramental elements, are furnished at the public charge, on the same principle as hospitals and medicines are provided to the Company's servants free of expense.

Hence a whole system of Ecclesiastical Orders of Government comes into existence. The Government corresponds with the chaplains through the Bishop as the head of their department, and this *bureaucratic* relation entirely eclipses the spiritual. The Bishop in his episcopal character licenses the chaplains, he visits and delivers a Charge, (which, by the way, used to reach his clergy first in the columns of a London Paper;) but the chaplains are appointed and removed from church to church by the Government: their emoluments and duties are all controlled by Government regulations: and the Bishop's power practically depends upon his personal influence with the clergy, or upon the amount of pressure which his private acquaintance with the Governor enables him to apply. An Ecclesiastical Court has been provided by law; but it has never been opened: and Bishop Heber's attempt to constitute his Consistory proved a failure. There is no power, it seems, of enforcing the attendance of witnesses or the execution of the decree. Bishop Spencer says:—

'The Bishops have sufficient authority over the subordinate Clergy, *when they are on good terms* with the Government of the day; but if the Government and the Bishop happen to disagree, then the Bishop, I am bound to say, is not so much supported as he ought to be.'—*Lords' Committee Second Report, 1853, Qu. 8,418.*

The episcopal licence possesses no greater value in the eyes of an Indian Governor than of a Foreign Secretary of State. We remember a chaplain removed from his station by the Governor in opposition to the Bishop, as a punishment for some alleged neglect of duty at a funeral. He was appointed to a less eligible station at a considerable distance (thus mulcting him in

¹ Some of these bishops occasionally receive a further allowance as chaplains themselves; and there is a proposal to raise the three bishops at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay to about 500*l.* a-year, and give increased official recognition to them and their clergy. The government favour has been strongly marked towards them, but it is checked by the frequent ebullitions of the Irish Priests. On more than one occasion the troops have been marched out of Chapel to avoid their seditious sermons; and the Brigadier at Secunderabad was compelled to expel a bishop by force from the cantonment!

the costs of removal), and another chaplain was nominated to succeed him. The Bishop refused to alter the licences of either; but on the appearance of the exchange in the Government Orders, the salaries of both clergymen ceased till they had reported their arrival at the stations to which they were appointed. Of course they were obliged to officiate in their new churches without licences. Indeed it has been questioned whether by their appointments under the Royal Charter with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Company's chaplains are not legally qualified to officiate within the British territories without further ecclesiastical sanction. A still more summary proceeding was resolved on by one of the Madras Governors. Finding he could not prevail on the Clergy to sanction the admission of Dissenting Missionaries to officiate at funerals in the consecrated burying-grounds, he directed a portion of the adjoining ground (unconsecrated) to be annexed to every government grave-yard: and then, to abolish invidious distinctions, actually ordered the wall of the consecrated portion to be thrown down, so as to unite the two within one enclosure, and the funerals of Dissenters to be admitted at the original gate, and so pass over the consecrated ground to their own.

With such Governors it is manifestly unsafe for the Bishop to apply the *argumentum ad orumenam* to a chaplain. It may often recoil with an unpleasant force upon himself. After all, too, bishop, archdeacon, and chaplain, being every one stipendiaries on the public treasury, and all their incidental expenses charged in addition on the same quarter, it is perfectly natural that Government should expect the work it pays for—and pays with great liberality—to be executed under its own orders and to the taste of the employer.

In short, this establishment is a pure Erastianism; and the effects are sometimes curious. On one occasion when it was proposed to build a new church at our friend's station, the engineer officer received instructions from the Military Board to prepare the plans, just as would be done for a barrack or other public building. Being well acquainted with the officer, the chaplain carried him his rough design, and proposed to consult on the plans to be submitted. He was little prepared for the good-natured merriment with which the other enjoyed the idea of the *Padre* stepping out of his own department to meddle with brick and chunam: he might as well have proposed to assist in breaching a fortress. It was the soldier's business to build the church, the clergyman's to preach in it. But as church architecture forms no part of the Addiscombe *curriculum*, there is of course little ecclesiastical propriety in our Indian churches. Another result is that these churches, even after consecration, are still

regarded as Government property. They are cleaned and repaired by the public servants, two military officers being usually nominated as 'trustees' to act in conjunction with the chaplain in applying for the necessary orders. Our friend was once incautious enough to ask the commissariat officer to supply his church with two dozen towels to clean the lamps. The requisition was readily complied with; but some months after he received a portentous looking official despatch from the major, enclosing another of still larger dimensions from the auditor-general, which directed him immediately to demand of the chaplain the sum of four rupees (eight shillings!) in payment for the said towels; and to refer the reverend delinquent to the orders of Government, under which the Church Committee should prepare an *indent* (on foolscap paper, and made out in *quadruplicato*) to be sent to the Bishop, who was to forward it (*in triplicato*) to the Governor in Council, who would transmit it *in duplicate* to the Military Board, who would finally return to our station the single copy garnished with all these 'potent, grave, and reverend' signatures; and then the four rupees were to be returned, and the towels appropriated for ever to the use of the church. The chaplain answered that considering the price of foolscap in India, and the other labours of the Bishop and Governor (not to mention his own) in that oppressive climate, he preferred to pay the rupees, and leave alone the suggested game at the 'House that Jack built.'

A Government clergy implies of course a Government laity. Having slipped the yoke of their original charter, the Directors steadily close their purses against the spiritual necessities of any but the servants of Her Majesty and the Honourable Company. At the Presidency towns, where a large European and East Indian population is resident, comprising barristers, merchants, and other 'respectable' men, a larger number, both of churches and chaplains, are maintained than the 'principle' would absolutely justify; a deviation partly compensated by levying pew rents in aid of the expenses of Divine Service. Anything, however, like a Christian community is utterly ignored. Sir James Melvill, when questioned with regard to parts of the south of India, where entire villages have become Christian, doubts 'whether the authorities would be willing to provide the means of Christian instruction for the inhabitants.'—*Analysis*, p. 121.

The rulers of India have no idea of Government *aid* without Government *agency*; and though in these parts no question of 'conversion' arises, the Secretary has an equally plausible reason for non-interference:—

'There are institutions in the country connected with the native creeds; but a great object of the Government, for many years past, has been to get rid of all connexion with them.'—*Ibid.* p. 122.

So in common fairness there must be no encouragement of Christian creeds either! Time was when the championship of idolatry (for which it was pretended the faith of Government had been plighted to the natives) was made the plea for discountenancing Christianity. Now the recently enforced renunciation of that degrading connexion is made to serve the same end. Meanwhile it must be always remembered that the instruction of their native dependents 'in the Protestant religion' is a *legal obligation* on the Honourable Company, independently of the great argument of Christian responsibilities.

We shall return to this subject by-and-by; at present we would point out that the Government Church is *de facto* composed only of the Government servants. Now, when it is remembered that, with a few insignificant exceptions, these are foreigners sojourning in the country for their own temporary occasions, and all—clergy no less than laity—looking to England as their home, it must be apparent that these chaplains and their congregations have scarcely any pretension to the character of a local Church. Their connexion with the bishop is of the most transitory and technical description; nor, as the congregations are constantly changing chaplains, has the parochial relation any more substantial existence.

Let us proceed then to the Missions of the Church of England; where the Gospel is certainly preached without distinction of race or occupation, and Christian worship is planted among the people as a matter of religion, not of Government administration.

Our Missions are conducted partly by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and partly by the Church Missionary Society, both without aid from the Government or any recognised connexion with the 'Government Church.'

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has inherited the Missions formerly carried on by the Lutheran Missionaries maintained by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and into which the original Danish Mission at Tranquebar,—the mother of all the flourishing Churches now blooming in the south of India,—has more recently merged.

The principles and practice of this excellent Society are well known to our readers. Its missionaries are not only placed under the bishop *in spiritualibus*, but the ecclesiastical authorities are the Society's agents and representatives in all affairs whatever. The bishop is in fact the Society, in regard to whatever is to be done within his diocese. He has usually a credit in Pall-Mall to draw upon as he sees occasion. He selects, appoints, and removes the missionaries at his pleasure. Missions are opened and relinquished by his sole authority, or by a Committee in which he is supreme. Then, the Indian episcopate finds no

lack of support. Ample verge and room enough is given it to take root and grow out into an indigenous Church; of which Tinnevely and Sawyerpooram give more than promise.

It must be borne in mind, however, that all the Society's missionaries are stipendiaries on the treasury in Pall Mall, as the chaplains are on that of the Honourable Company. There is no danger in their case of the bishop being resisted; but then it is the bag rather than the keys by which he binds or looses. It is as the Society's agent that he obtains the power which his spiritual office alone, in its present constitution, could not exert. This is proved by the actual results under the different system of the Church Missionary Society. The ecclesiastical relations of Bishop, Priest, and Patron, are defined in their regulations more distinctly than by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and more accurately than by the Governments of India. They relegate the bishop strictly to his spiritual office; not professing to introduce a clergyman except under his licence, and charging their missionaries to observe all due canonical obedience to the bishop. They only reserve to their Committee the powers of patron; that is, of nominating and removing the missionary, as well as of controlling every proceeding which requires—and what is there that does not require?—the outlay of money. For here again the missionaries are stipendiaries, and their churches, schools, and every item of necessary expenditure, entirely at the mercy of the lay patron. This is the Salisbury Square theory. But we are not aware that ecclesiastical patrons in any other case retain the power of *removing* the clerk whom they present to be instituted to cure of souls.

The Bishop then finds himself practically in the same dilemma with this Society that he does with the Government. While at amity with the guardians of the purse, he may do as he likes with the clergy; but should a difference of 'views' arise, 'he is not so well supported as he ought to be.' The missionary who may prefer his diocesan's views to those of his *patron*, will not long find himself in a position to retain his canonical relations. The proceeding is not so uncereceremonious as a Government order; yet the missionary is equally divested of his mundane accessories: his schoolmasters, readers, catechists are removed, yea his church, and the very house over his head, entered upon as 'Mission Property'; and the interdict will remain till the delinquent is gone, and the successor, humbly nominated for the bishop's licence, has been graciously admitted in his place. The stipendiary relation, as usual, swallows up every other.

It appears from the evidence of Mr. Tucker that the Church

Missionary Society has in India 88 ordained clergymen (of whom 73 are Europeans, 3 East Indians, and 12 natives), and that their converts amount to 36,401. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has 43 ordained Missionaries, with 22,905 Native Christians: making a total of 131 clergymen, and 59,306 laity. Hence the non-official Church of England is more numerous than the official.

Another return delivered in by Mr. Tucker gives the results of all the Protestant Missionary Societies in India and Ceylon, up to January 1852. From this statement, which was compiled with great care by a Conference of all denominations at Calcutta, it appears that the total number of Mission Stations is 272, Missionaries, 400; Communicants, 17,622; Native Christians, 108,174. Of these the Church of England has 110 Stations, 139 Missionaries, 10,647 Communicants, and 64,235 Native Christians: 'showing that with not half the Stations, and just a third the number of Missionaries, the Church has gathered in from the heathen half as many more than all the other Societies put together, and has a still larger proportion of communicating members.

Some of this superiority may be owing to the riper growth of a portion of our Missions; but we are persuaded that it chiefly arises from the superior efficacy of the Church's system. A large portion of the results often attributed to other agencies might be traced to the use of the Book of Common Prayer, now translated into various languages. Thus in Ceylon, the largest Wesleyan congregation was that of Dr. Percival, who had adopted the whole Church Services, said *chorally*, in Tamul. In our friend's station in India there were ordinarily eight or nine missionaries of the London and Wesleyan Societies, and not one of the Church of England. Yet when he erected a Native Church and opened a Mission, to which (having the whole care of the station at that time upon his hands) but a small portion of his personal labours could be given, the Native congregation far outnumbered those of the three dissenting Missions put together.² The experience of this truth it is, which has

	Stations.	Missionaries.	Communicants.	Native Christians.
¹ Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.	49	44	5,025	25,498
Church Missionary Society	61	95	5,622	38,737
	110	139	10,647	64,235

The last published Reports of the two Societies make the Missionaries in *English Orders* to be—*Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, 53; *Church Missionary Society*, 94; Total, 147; i.e. eight more than stated in this return.

² The happiest effects were experienced from the observance of daily prayer in this church; a practice almost universal among our Native Congregations. It

latterly led many of the best missionaries of other denominations (including Dr. Percival) to seek admission into the Church.

With such facts before us, it is the more deeply to be regretted that our Church should be still without a permanent footing in India. With the exception of the Bishop of Calcutta's noble design of a cathedral (fit companion to Bishop Middleton's college), nothing has yet been done or attempted towards endowing the Church as an indigenous institution. Our bishops, chaplains, and missionaries are with a few exceptions aliens and sojourners in the land: all of them are stipendiaries on a foreign exchequer. Three strokes of the pen in London would suffice to extinguish the Church in India. Let the Russians occupy Calcutta, and while the Brahminical and Mahometan religions (equally the introduction of foreign invaders) would remain rooted in the land, the Anglican would have disappeared and 'left not a wreck behind.'

This reflection must be often forced upon the thoughts of those who turn to the Portuguese churches in the south and west of India. The political power of that nation—never equal to our own—has long entirely ceased. Yet they have left an archbishopric at Goa, which at this day is contending against Rome itself for the primacy of India, and in the heart of our own stations, and all along our coasts, their priests maintain their footing by means of endowments wisely provided while the opportunity was allowed.¹ Yet we who respect these endow-

was the constant rallying point of the Christians, and the principal means of aggression on the heathen. Many of the latter frequently paused to witness and listen to the new *poojah* (worship); when the temple full of light, and void of idols—the worshippers all admitted within the temple—the constant spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—and their audible intercourse with heaven, in prayers on the one hand and absolution and benedictions on the other—proved effectual with some to inquire further, and finally to embrace the truth. Without a single preaching in the street, (for which he had no time or opportunity,) this chaplain baptized above one hundred Natives in five years, and increased the congregation from forty to three hundred. The Visitation of the Sick, also, and the Burial Service, had a great Missionary influence.

¹ During the sway of the Portuguese a Concordat was established with Rome, by which the 'Primacy of the Indies' was granted to the Archbishop of Goa, and the patronage of that and the other sees conceded to the Crown of Portugal. This arrangement subsisted down to the overthrow of Dom Miguel, when the Holy See, not choosing to recognise the title of Donna Maria, discovered that the Crown of Portugal had no longer any claim to authority in India, and superseded the Concordat. This determination, being contemporaneous with certain efforts of the Irish Roman Catholic Members of Parliament in London, was believed in India to have had reference to the celebrated Lichfield House compact. Certain it is that a posse of Irish Bishops and Priests suddenly landed in Madras, armed with the Papal authority, and proceeded to lay claim to the endowments of the Portuguese. Their pretensions were immediately countenanced at Government House, where the 'Roman Catholic Bishop of Madras' (though no such title was bestowed in the bulls of the Vicar Apostolic) became a frequent guest. The Government further recognised him as the official representative of the Roman Catholic Clergy,

ments whilst lamenting their present inefficient application, are content to scour the face of the country with a cloud of spiritual Cossacks, ready to draw bridle and disappear at the sound of the bugle! After perusing the evidence taken by the Parliamentary Committees, we are more than ever convinced that it is to this point attention is now chiefly, if not solely, demanded; all the rest is mere matter of detail. But we will not anticipate.

In the spring of 1852, a joint conference was opened in London, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Church Missionary Society, to take into consideration the measures that should be proposed to Parliament. After several meetings it was resolved—

‘That it is advisable—1. To press for an increase of the episcopate in India. 2. To represent the necessity of an increased number of chaplains and assistant chaplains, and to ask for grants-in-aid towards the support of clergymen in the smaller English stations, where there is no chaplain or assistant chaplain. 3. To recommend the appointment of native sub-assistant chaplains, as already recommended by the Bishop of Calcutta, to minister to native Christians connected with the Honourable Company’s service. 4. To point out the importance of increased means, and an improved system of education in India, and to call attention to the especial claims of the poorer classes of Europeans and East Indians connected with the public service.’—*Lords’ Second Report, App. P.*

and transferred the military duties from the poor Portuguese priests, to the Irishmen nominated by ‘his Lordship.’ The ‘Diocesan’ clergy were not so easily persuaded. The Bishop elect of St. Thomé administering under the Archbishop of Goa, though denied episcopal consecration by the Holy See, garrisoned his Cathedral, and charged all his vicars to resist the Irish Capuchin. A battle royal would have ensued but for a Scotch Justice of the Peace (doubtless a Presbyterian), who threatened the Irish with the terrors of a ‘summary conviction,’ and they withdrew. The question was afterwards brought into the Supreme Court, where the claims of Rome against Portugal were solemnly argued before a chief justice who had sworn that ‘no foreign Prince, Prelate, Pope, or Potentate, hath or ought to have any power, &c. within Her Majesty’s dominions!’

The Archbishop of Goa has been once recalled to Rome, but the Arch-Chapter sent for the Bishop of Macao, and still carry on the war. The curious result is, that while recognised by the Holy See within the limits of their own Diocese as good Catholics,—the moment they pass beyond it to exercise the ‘primacy,’ they and their priests are pronounced schismatical. The whole transaction is represented by the Romish adherents as a mark of the Pope’s friendly disposition towards the British Crown, by granting his authority only to British subjects, and they request our Government in return not to recognise any Goa priest.

The latter, on the other hand, appeal to the English Clergy to support the Native ‘Diocesan’ authority against the Propaganda at Rome. We remember a chaplain holding a conversation in Latin on the top of St. Thomas’s Mount with one of these good men, in which they both cordially agreed that the Pope would do well to look to his own Diocese, instead of meddling with theirs. The worthy priest (who was as black as our shoe) was clad in a white cotton cassock, confined by a single button on his shoulder: and as this was the Padre’s *only* garment, and the skirt blew freely in the wind, while they paced up and down before his church, his outer man was perhaps *cooler* than the inner.

Such was the case presented on the part of the Church ; and to sustain it, the witnesses called were, the Right Rev. Bishop Spencer late of Madras, the Right Rev. Bishop Carr late of Bombay, Archdeacon Shortland a Madras Chaplain, the Rev. W. Keane, who astonished Lord Ellenborough by giving in the designation of 'Missionary Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral Calcutta,' and the Rev. J. Tucker, Secretary to the Church Missionary Society, who for experience, largeness of views, and practical acquaintance with his subject, we may say without flattery, is by far the most deserving of attention. No one appeared on behalf of the other Societies, an omission which we can neither explain nor approve of. It would have been well, also, if some more of the Company's chaplains had been examined, especially those who, having been stationed up the country, have combined Missionary exertions with their official duties.

On the first of the wants before named, there is not an entire agreement among the witnesses. Bishops Wilson and Spencer both press for a division of their dioceses by the erection of new sees at Agra and Trichinopoly. Bishop Carr would be content with a rearrangement of the boundaries between Bombay and Madras. Mr. Tucker, admitting the diocese of Calcutta to be too large, is not of the same opinion with regard to Madras, where he thinks other objects of more importance than an increase of the episcopate. He objects also to a transfer of the whole western coast to the diocese of Bombay. The Court of Directors, it is understood, object to any increase of the episcopate, conceiving it to be of more importance to augment the number of chaplains ; and upon the principle laid down by the Court, *and apparently accepted by the others*, they are, we conceive, in the right. This is a point on which we must claim to speak frankly : and we must be understood to speak distinctly of Indian Bishops as they are, not as we conceive they should be.

We do not undervalue the characters or labours of any of our Indian bishops ; and we hold it to be well-nigh impossible to place a successor of the apostles in any country, and upon any system, without much advantage being experienced. But, certainly, when we look at the field which lies before our Indian bishops, the length of time that has elapsed since the erection of their sees, the cost at which they are maintained, and the number of clergy provided for their assistance, without charge or pecuniary responsibility to themselves,—and when we contrast them in these respects with other prelates beyond seas,—we must say we are far from regarding the Indian episcopate with the enthusiasm which so justly attaches

to the Colonial Church in general. It is an axiom at home, that 'as is the schoolmaster so is the school;' and if the Church in India is ever to be set on an improved and permanent footing, we are persuaded the reform must begin with the episcopate. Here, then, we must speak out.

The root of the evil is to be found in the bishop being generally considered, and in considering himself, as a part of the Government Ecclesiastical Establishment. His name is so given in, in all the returns submitted to Parliament. This is the position he occupies in India, as between the Government and their chaplains; in this character alone he is known to the European laity; and this is the light in which he is introduced to the notice of the admiring natives. Escorts and salutes attend his progress through the country; the heathen officials are instructed to meet his lordship with the posse of the Collectorate; and a military friend of ours having to issue such instructions, and doubting how far the natives would or ought to respect the spiritual functionary, actually described him in the public orders as 'General Lord Bishop of the Presidency.' We shall not easily forget another friend's account of his astonishment, when driving his lordship past the main-guard the officer and his men turned out, and three ruffles of the drum proclaimed the presence of a general officer!

In this official capacity, then, we must agree with the Directors, that there is little occasion for an increase of the episcopate. The chaplains ordained in England, and approved by the Archbishop or Bishop of London, may well be trusted with their official duties. Bishop Wilson suggests a doubt on this head, in proposing that the ecclesiastical patronage should be transferred from the Directors to the Indian Bishops; but Bishop Spencer says,—

'I cannot agree with the Bishop of Calcutta on that point; it would embarrass the Bishop, I think. I should not myself desire it.'—*Lords' Committee, Qn. 8,384.*

And again:—

'During my episcopate, highly respectable men were sent out by the Court of Directors to India. I have heard that in former times this was not the case; but I have no reason to question their having made a very good choice in my time. . . . As a whole, I think their appointments were very good.'—*Ibid. Qn. 8,379.*

Certainly, we should say, the results of the Directors' ecclesiastical patronage will well bear a comparison with any other. Such being the case, and considering the routine character of their duties, their need,—indeed their experience,—of episcopal supervision, is but small. We never knew a chaplain who supposed himself or his people to derive any advantage from the Bishop's visits, beyond his confirming or consecrating

a church. Indeed, a highly judicious and long experienced chaplain once assured us, that he doubted if in many respects matters were not better managed when there was only one bishop in all India than with three. He meant that the action of Government (which in the long run must prevail over their own Establishments) was better conciliated by one bishop at the seat of the supreme government, and an archdeacon at every presidency, than by three independent diocesans. This, it will be said, was a low view to take. We admit it; but it is the view which pervades the evidence before us, and is perhaps universal in India itself. We shall be glad enough, as we hope soon to show, to turn to a higher and more genuine survey of the episcopal office.

But have the Indian Bishops proved of no greater advantage to the *Missions*? Doubtless they have. In ordaining more missionaries, in visiting and confirming their flocks, and in their influence with the Societies and the public, both in India and at home the Bishops, even on their present dejected footing, have very greatly enlarged and improved our missionary operations.

It is well known, however, that Bishop Middleton refused to license any Missionary clergy;—considering the chaplains as exclusively the Established Church, and the proper subjects of his jurisdiction. To this day, also, the interest manifested by an Indian Bishop in the mission churches is regarded by the ruling and largest portion of his countrymen as an extra-official, perhaps romantic, work of supererogation. With the great majority of the army—and in much of India the army is the English community—the word ‘Clergyman’ is synonymous with ‘Chaplain,’ and ‘Missionary’ with ‘Dissenter.’ Our generals and colonels hear of the Bishop going to visit a *mission* with much the same feeling as an English orthodox squire displays when the Bishop of Manchester pronounces an eulogium on dissenting zeal, or his right reverend brother of Durham contributes a five-pound note to aid the dissenting interests.

Doubtless the missionaries themselves welcome with warm and grateful feelings the visits of their chief pastor; brightened as they always are with an assurance of the kindest personal sympathy, and attended by well-earned encomiums from a quarter which to an English clergyman never speaks in vain. Doubtless, also, it is a great day for the native Christians,—ignored by European, and persecuted by heathen authorities,—when they can lead forth the early procession from their rejoicing villages to meet the episcopal palanquin, and exhibit to the bowing officials that he whom they are obliged to honour is their father and friend. Still the question returns, whether these pleasing results imperatively demand an increase of such

an episcopate? When we reflect that the Indian bishops have been, with only two exceptions, selected from the clergy at home, and that none of them, save good Bishop Corrie (whose name must not pass from our pen without a tribute to many excellences, shining, alas! too briefly, in a new and troubled episcopate), had any practical experience of Mission work,—or could even speak the language of the people who received the apostolical benediction from their mouths,—we cannot fancy that much has been added to our missionaries in conference with their bishops. They themselves are to a great extent identified with their people; they hold little Synods among themselves for the regulation of affairs; and they are in constant correspondence with their Committees. The Bishop is a foreigner, sojourning for a while in the country, filling a great official appointment, and looking forward to a pension with an honourable retirement in England. What is there in common between him and the native portions of his diocese? The missionary may, perhaps, get a chance of urging some favourite project on the consideration of the Committee or the Society; but in regard to ‘the work of the ministry,’ we cannot think it of any vital consequence whether he enjoys such an episcopal visit once in three years, or once in two. Mr. Tucker certainly does not think so; and taking the bishop as simply to supervise the clergy on the existing system—which is the view presented to Parliament—we do not know how it can be made out that Mr. Tucker is mistaken. Wishing well then, as we do, to every proposition for an increase of the episcopate, we wish to see it accompanied in the present instance with some proposals for developing the episcopate into a better agency for enabling the Church to take root and grow in the land. We must candidly admit that money can be better spent than in multiplying ecclesiastical generals to preside over Government bureaux, who visit their flocks with a body-guard of soldiers, and are received by forts and batteries with a discharge of cannon.

Such proposals we now proceed to suggest: and, first, we would cut off the notion of a bishop returning from any Indian diocese to spend the remainder of his days in Europe. A bishop should take his diocese ‘for better for worse;’ if not strictly ‘till death us do part,’ yet assuredly till the summons of the Church removes him to a higher sphere, or till age or sickness renders him absolutely incapable of duty. In the latter case, we would provide a comfortable and even dignified retirement; but to grant pensions after a certain period of service is to keep up an idea, which however proper to an officer on foreign service, is fatal to the position of a bishop in his own diocese. There, surely—if anywhere on this side the grave—is he to find his home.

It would in no degree lessen our satisfaction with this proposal, if the abolition of pensions as a matter of service should induce some English clergymen to decline the offer of an Indian bishopric. This would prove a wholesome check on the patronage of the Board of Control; for no man surely ought to 'take this honour to himself' till he is assured that God has called him to it, by finding himself willing to give up country and lands for its sake. Honour to the present Bishop of Calcutta! who, at an advanced age, having served nearly double his legal period, and being in fact once driven to England by alarming sickness, still cleaves to his spouse, and has determined to leave to the cathedral which he has so munificently founded the last and best legacy of its Bishop's ashes. Had he claimed his pension under the Act of Parliament, we might have seen, ere long, more Indian bishops living in inglorious ease at home than are serving against idolatry in the East. By all means, then, let us give up the pension (save upon rare emergencies), and let the equivalent sum be invested towards the extension of the episcopate, on the improved footing we are about to suggest.¹

Next, we should be disposed greatly to curtail the bishops' connexion with the Government offices. All the internal affairs of the Company's Ecclesiastical Establishment should be left to the regulations of Government, the correspondence being carried on through the archdeacon or senior chaplain, with a reference to the bishop when necessary. Bishop Spencer says,—

'I used to write, upon an average, six hours every day of my life, employing others to copy my letters, and I could hardly get through it. The desk was the great slavery of India. Foolish questions were put; questions which ought not to have been submitted to a bishop were made the subject of a long correspondence. The moving of a pulpit, the rearrangement of a church, the appointment of a sexton, and questions of that sort, which in England would be settled in a very short time (viz. by *not* being submitted to the bishop), there led to a lengthened correspondence.'—*Lords' Committee, Qu. 8,418.*

It is clear the bishops would gain much time by disconnecting themselves from such correspondence, and remitting it to one of the Government chaplains. We should like to know how much the Bishop of London knows of the correspondence carried on through the Chaplain-General at the War Office. It was thought that Bishop Spencer rather affected these matters, as increasing his authority over the chaplains: his successor has

¹ No reflection is here intended on either of the two Indian Prelates now resident in this country; one of whom has no pension, and the other served his full period as a Company's chaplain before his promotion to the archdeaconry and episcopate. It cannot, however, be forgotten that there is something of an anomaly in a pensioned and therefore veteran Indian Bishop being instituted to so large, populous, and onerous a Rectory as that of Bath.

actually devolved a large portion of them on the archdeacon. We would make the episcopal relief 'thorough.'

Our next desire would be to abolish all military honours, attendance of heathen officials, and whatever else tends to invest the bishop with the character of a great officer of state. The plea upon which these ceremonial observances are defended is that they are the usual forms of public respect in the country, not confined to military men, but extended to judges, envoys, and other civilians. True, but all these are in the service either of the Queen or the Honourable Company, whose authority properly demands a recognition from all classes of their subjects. It is precisely because we would not have the bishop considered in any earthly 'service' that we wish to do away with these badges of earthly honour. If his position should then appear unusual, it will be because his order has nothing equal or like it among the establishments of Government. Let Christians receive their chief pastor with all the honours that can be suggested. Christian officers and soldiers may salute in military fashion if they will; but natives who have never learnt to bow the knee to the Master, ought not to be called upon to pay obeisance to the disciple. We wonder this inconsistency has so long escaped the Directors, in their scrupulous regard for neutrality.

In seeking thus far to weaken the official character of the episcopate, our object is to give greater prominence to its Christian and ecclesiastical aspect. We will now mention the provisions which strike us as further requisite to this end.

In order to abolish the humiliating dependence of the Indian Church on the Governments of the day, we desire to see the salaries allotted to the bishops and archdeacons, as well as their allowances for visitation charges, converted into permanent endowments. These may remain if necessary, for a time, an annual charge on the revenue; but our ultimate object is to have the capital sum laid out in land; or, what may perhaps suit the circumstances of India better, the land revenue of certain districts transferred to the Church as *Jaghires* for the support of the episcopate. If this conversion were properly managed, a fund for the future increase of the episcopate would be supplied,¹ and the Government be entirely separated from payments which certainly do not harmonise with their professions of neutrality in religious matters.

Next, we are of opinion that the charter so long solicited by the Metropolitan for the incorporation of a *Chapter* at Calcutta

¹ That an increase is *needed*, is, of course, not to be doubted for a moment: we only wish it to be the growth of the country; not an external mechanism obtruded by Act of Parliament.

should be immediately granted; and further, that the same privilege should be extended to the cathedrals of Madras and Bombay. The East India Directors, after subscribing 15,000*l.* to the Calcutta cathedral, and adding another chaplain to their establishment for its service, are now objecting to the Bishop's application for letters patent to incorporate his Chapter, on the pretence that to erect any other corporation in India would be prejudicial to the Company's authority. Nothing could be more futile. The Supreme Court of Judicature has a charter from the Crown, by which it is established as an independent authority. The Queen's Commander-in-Chief is independent; and the bishops themselves are ecclesiastical corporations sole, established by letters patent from the Crown, and legally unconnected with the Company's government. There could be no possible inconvenience in incorporating, by the same authority, a capitular body to advise and assist in the execution of the episcopal office. Such a body is precisely what is most needed to remedy the anomalies now existing in India, and give extension and permanence to the Church, without involving 'Government agency.'

We do not stop to inquire whether the patent as proposed by the Bishop of Calcutta, and settled by the law officers of Sir R. Peel's administration, contains in all respects the most eligible provisions. It is a noble design, conceived in an ardent spirit, and carried forward with splendid liberality; it would be ungenerous to criticise, unwise to mutilate it. The Bishop has given upwards of 22,000*l.* from his own purse, bringing the endowment fund up to 30,000*l.*, besides 80,000*l.* spent on the edifice; 15,000*l.* more is ready to be added from the Begum Sumroo's Fund, which is at the Bishop's disposal; and he would have collected another 15,000*l.* before now, but for the unreasonable jealousy displayed against the regular constitution of his Church. We should esteem it 'a heavy blow and a great discouragement,' if the vault under the altar of S. Paul's, Calcutta, should be opened to receive the bones of its founder before his eyes had seen his devout aspirations realized, and these munificent offerings to God's service resting in the guardianship of a lawful Chapter.

We say, then, that not only should the Calcutta patent be perfected without delay, but that the time is arrived for the establishment of similar institutions at the other presidencies; and we go further: we confidently affirm that the Indian revenues may and ought to be charged with their endowment. This assertion brings us into collision with sundry propositions which pass for maxims at the India House; and as these will meet us at every branch of the inquiry, both as to Church efficiency

and native education, we may as well proceed at once to examine them.

Foremost is the statement of Sir James Melvill, that—

‘The Directors have laid it down as a principle, that the religious benefit of the servants of Government is the *only* ground upon which an ecclesiastical establishment can be maintained at the charge of the Indian revenue.’

This principle we must beg leave to examine. And, first, we would ask how long it has entered into the system of the Indian governments? It was clearly not the principle of the Brahminical princes, who endowed the pagodas with the vast revenues which our own Government only lately ceased to administer. It was not the principle of the Mahometan invaders, who carried on the conversion of their subjects through the ‘government agency’ of the sword. It was not the principle of the Portuguese, when they endowed bishoprics and vicarages for the permanent establishment of the Roman Catholic religion. It was not the principle of the authors of the East India Company’s Charter, when they imposed a provision for the instruction of their Gentoo slaves in the Protestant faith; nor of the Imperial legislature in later times when it charged the Indian revenues with the support of three episcopal sees. Finally, the Company’s governments knew nothing of such a principle all the time of their connexion with idolatry, when they paid for idols, sacrifices, and priests out of revenues administered by their officers, and the balance of which was carried to the public account.

However plausible, then, this principle may sound, it has never been practically recognised, nor can the authorities who assert it make it square with their own proceedings. At the foot of an account prepared at the East India House, we find the following remark:—

‘There are also about thirty priests of the Portuguese Church drawing allowances at rates varying from 10 rupees to 15 rupees *per mensem*, for ministering to the wants of the native members of their Church. THESE STIPENDS HAVE BEEN PAID FROM TIME IMMEMORIAL, and are quite exceptional, no provision being made in any other place for the spiritual wants of either Protestants or Roman Catholics not being servants of Government.’—*Commons’ Sixth Report, App. No. 6.*

No doubt these payments are ‘exceptional,’ from the rule now laid down at the India House; but that this rule is itself the exception from the practical system of the Indian Governments, is shown from these stipends having been paid from time immemorial. They were probably inherited from the Portuguese government. We could point also to Government allowances made to Swartz, Gericke, and other Protestant Missionaries for the support of their Missions and schools. But

it is only necessary to refer to the present state of the Company's ecclesiastical establishments in the presidency towns to see that, in respect both to chaplains and churches, others than the servants of Government are provided.

How indeed, upon their 'principle,' will the Directors justify the assistance already given to the new cathedral at Calcutta? The English congregation worshipping therein may be chiefly, though not entirely, composed of Government servants (for whom, however, other churches had before been provided), but this will hardly save the 'principle.' In laying the foundation-stone, the Bishop publicly proclaimed his design in these words:—

'In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, one God blessed for ever, I lay this foundation-stone of the Cathedral Church of S. Paul, Calcutta, designed for a body of devout and learned clergy to conduct the worship of Almighty God therein, according to the doctrine and discipline of the Apostolic Protestant Church of England and Ireland, and to unite with these duties the functions of lecturers on the evidences of the truth of Christianity, and pastors and teachers amongst the heathen and Mahomedan population.'—*Ibid.* *Qu.* 7958.

So that here not only 'other than Government servants' are provided for, but 'conversion' itself is a principal object of an institution to which the Company could still subscribe £15,000. There is no ground whatever, then, for supposing that the alleged principle was ever a recognised rule of action to the Indian Government. It is important to note this, or we may be told by-and-by that the faith of Government is pledged to the natives for its observance.

Is the principle, then, sound in itself? We say, no: the duty of a Government in this respect is not different towards subjects and servants. If it be their duty to supply the one with the means of religious worship and teaching, it is equally their duty to supply the other. If it be wrong (as the insinuation runs) to take the money of the heathen tax-payer to provide for the worship of his Christian fellow-subject, it must be no less wrong to take it for the spiritual benefit of his European masters, who are far better able to provide for themselves. If you justify the latter on the plea that it is for the benefit of the tax-payer, that having Christian masters they should be preserved under the influence of their religion instead of lapsing into atheism, the answer is obvious, that the interests of society no less require the same care of the Christian community. In point of principle there is no distinction, and the attempt to draw it appears to rest upon a mistaken analogy.

In England, where there is an Established Church—established mainly through royal encouragement and endowments—the Government has no occasion to provide the means of reli-

gion, except for those whom the public service, or the sentence of the law, withdraws from the ordinary opportunities. It provides for soldiers and sailors, but not for civil and political servants; it has chaplains in workhouses and prisons, but not in Downing-street or Whitehall. This precedent does not justify the Indian Government in providing clergymen for all classes receiving its pay, and leaving all the rest of their fellow-Christians without provision, in a land where the public endowments are wholly in the possession of the heathen.

In England, again, the Government has no revenue but what is drawn from the taxes, which by our constitution are expended under the control of the people. But in India, the natives have no voice either in assessing or expending the revenue, which in fact partakes more of the nature of rents and royalties, than of taxes. As a wider latitude is allowed, so greater responsibilities appertain to proprietors than to mere administrations. Nothing wrong or unjust should be attempted by either; but it is the conscience of the owner that decides in the one case, and of the people in the other. Would it be unjust to the other tenants to provide for the spiritual wants of those who profess the religion of Government? that is the question.

After a long protection of idolatry, the Directors have been suddenly seized with the conviction that neutrality to every form of religion is the only consistent policy. But where in all the world—save perhaps in some of the United States of America—is such a ‘principle’ to be discovered? And is a young and vigorous republic, where Government is of small account in any thing, to furnish precedents for oriental monarchies, where the sovereign owns every foot of the soil, and centuries of despotism have taught the abject millions to regard the State as the impersonation of power? If the practice of European monarchies be any rule, it would be nearer the truth to say that Government is bound to provide for all the religions of their Indian subjects, rather than to disregard them all. In fact, Mahomedanism and idolatry are cared for. The means of worship have been provided by former Governments in sufficient abundance for all their votaries, and no one proposes to disturb these endowments. Christianity alone is destitute; it would be but even-handed justice to admit her to similar advantages.

There remains one objection to be encountered, but that has been disposed of years ago.

‘Apprehensions as to the consequences of Government interfering to afford facilities for the instruction of natives in the Christian religion appear to be felt by distinguished persons in India, better acquainted with the feelings of the people here than residents in England can be.’—*Analysis*, p. 122.

This is the old story. We heard the same when the first bishopric was established, when the missionaries were introduced, when the practice of Suttee was abolished, when the discontinuance of Government idolatry was insisted upon. In short, whenever any improvement in religion or education has been suggested, this was the uniform cry. Sir James Melvill admits that these apprehensions on former occasions, have not been justified by experience. No disturbance at any time has been caused by missionaries or Christian institutions; while some of 'these distinguished persons in India' have more than once (as at Vellore) provoked rebellion by their ignorance or disregard of native prejudices. Why should any one imagine a class, which has been invariably wrong on former occasions, likely to be now better informed than the missionaries who have lived among the people, and known how to convert 100,000 to Christianity, without any of the predicted evils ensuing?

An 'apprehension' of this sort was exhibited not long ago among some of the native inhabitants of Madras, and the 'distinguished persons' made the most of it against the introduction of the Bible into the Government schools. But Mr. Tucker, who was in Madras at the time, and passed through the mob in his palanquin (being perfectly well known), tells us that—

'In that, as in other cases also, it was simply a European movement, urging on and exciting the natives to hold those meetings. . . . The natives never would have troubled themselves about it.'—*Lords' Committee, Qn. 8,290.*

No, nor about the other questions of 'civil and religious liberty,' on which their 'distinguished' patrons are so anxious to get up a little rebellion. The native conscience is differently constituted. He is strongly wedded to his own religious rites; but he has no objection—quite the contrary—to persons of other religions enjoying theirs. He does not think that truth is one, and every creed not agreeing with his own an enemy to be put down. Neither does he calculate that the expenditure of Government comes out of his pocket, and feel aggrieved by all they contribute to other religions. He would be much in the wrong if he did. Let the public revenues be spent how they may, it makes no difference to his assessment; and his religious feelings are gratified—not wounded—when he sees the Government honouring its own faith, and providing temples and priests for the worship of the European's God.

The fallacy lies in this: the Directors do not distinguish between Government agency, and Government aid; nor between 'conversion' and the care of those who are already converted to Christianity. We agree with Bishop Heber in not wishing the Company's Government to engage in the work of proselytism.

They have no commission for it, and they would probably do more harm than good by attempting it. But that is no reason why the Imperial legislature should not appropriate some portion of the Indian revenues to the support of Christianity by means of other agencies. We have established Supreme Courts of Judicature to administer the English laws; and we may equally establish Bishops, with all that is requisite to the efficiency of their office, not to superintend the Company's chaplains merely, but to plant and propagate the English Church, independently of the political administration.

No objection then can be maintained, on the score of principle or expediency, to the erection of Chapters, in each of the predependencies, at the public charge; and we believe that such institutions would be eminently beneficial in sustaining the episcopal office, and supplying the means of ecclesiastical administration. Their constitution comes next to be considered.

It must be borne in mind, that in the presidency towns the Court of Directors do not at present observe their own principle. They have two chaplains at each cathedral, and others in other churches, whose position and duties are much the same with parochial clergymen's in England. If we except the garrison chaplain, there appears no reason why the Presidency Clergy should be under the orders of Government at all. We propose, therefore, that the salaries now allotted to such chaplains should be converted into the endowment of the cathedral chapter, and that the Canons should undertake the parochial charge of the Presidency towns. In other words (reserving the garrison chaplain for military duties,) we would place the Church in these towns on the same footing that it is at home, and constitute the several vicars (with the archdeacon) the cathedral chapter.¹ This would involve no additional charge on the Indian revenues: but only a slight transfer of patronage from the Directors: for the Canons should hereafter be nominated by the Bishop, and in fact would not belong to the 'Company's Service.'

We need not stop to point out the manifold uses of a capitular body in each of the Indian dioceses. One important duty would be the management of the Church Jaghires. Another, the custody of all consecrated churches and graveyards, which should be transferred from their present unsatisfactory footing to the care of the Bishop and Chapter; without prejudice, of course, to their use as at present by the chaplains and missionaries. A repair fund should be annexed to each by their present proprietors: and the Chapter would appoint a scale of fees to provide the necessary establishment of servants. Another

¹ It might be kept open to the Church Societies and others to found additional stalls.

would be the trusteeship of subscriptions in aid of new churches. These we have known commenced at different stations, and not proving immediately adequate to the object in view, the sums collected have remained in private hands, with no security for their due appropriation.

The consistency and weight which such chapters might lend to every exercise of episcopal authority, would go far to supply all that is lacking to the moral support of the Bishop, and add enormously to his efficiency in planting and extending the Church. One of their first efforts doubtless would be to meet a want complained of by all who have experience in either department of Indian labour, viz. an appropriate and consistent system of ecclesiastical discipline. This would suggest and require a revised body of local *Canons*, which again would necessitate some synodical action: and there we must leave them, while we turn our attention to the remaining portions of the subject before ourselves.

We have discussed this first division at greater length, because in India, as elsewhere, the reform of the Episcopate is the reform of the Church; and also because we have thus disposed of the principal objections encountered at the other stages of the great Christian argument. We now proceed to the remainder of the propositions placed before Parliament on behalf of the Church.

That the present number of Government Chaplains is not adequate to the purposes for which they are appointed, is undeniable. It does not even suffice for the spiritual necessities of the Government servants, according to the principle laid down by the Directors. It is found that on an average one-fourth of the whole number is ordinarily non-efficient, through absence, sickness, and death. Hence the recognised Chaplains' Stations are frequently unfilled; while it must be obvious from what has been already stated that their outlying districts are too extensive. The Station we have referred to was always allowed two Chaplains, and latterly three; yet for nearly two years the whole duties (besides the little Mission) were devolved upon one, comprising three services with sermons every Sunday in the church, two other similar services in the week, and at the least four lectures in as many military hospitals, besides attending to the sick, the schools, and the very oppressive duty at the burial-ground, for the largest European cantonment in the Presidency. We need hardly say that the district was left unvisited for much of that time. Yet the evil is vast which results from the long periods during which civil and military officers at the outstations are left without the visits of a Chaplain. If the principal person is not religiously disposed, the Lord's-day passes without the usual recognition of assembling for prayers read by one of themselves:

and not seldom much mischief ensues from the opposite cause. Officers in such remote situations, when affected, as they often are, with very strong views of religion, are naturally dissatisfied with so meagre an allowance of spiritual privileges, and seek to enlarge it by unauthorised ministrations. Instead of reading the liturgy with a sermon supplied by the chaplain, they will turn preachers themselves, or seek the aid of dissenting Missionaries. We have even known a military officer presume to administer the Lord's Supper, alleging (with perfect truth) that twice a-year was not a sufficient supply of that holy sacrament, and adding that in the absence of the clergy the laity must help themselves!¹ Hence a melancholy amount of disorder becomes added to the spiritual destitution of India. Our readers may often have remarked how many of the Company's servants on returning from India join the sect of the Plymouth Brethren.

Against such representations the Directors plead, of course, the expense, and the augmentations actually made in late years to their Ecclesiastical Establishment. But as the last augmentation was accompanied by a graduated scale of salaries and a general reduction of furlough and retiring allowances, we question whether, in the long run, the revenue will not prove a gainer by the transaction. Certainly the Ecclesiastical Establishments are not yet placed on an equal footing with the other departments of Government. During the time our friend was sole chaplain at —, the medical staff of the station was as follows: Superintending surgeon, Garrison surgeon, Civil surgeon, two surgeons to each of the European regiments and the artillery, and one apiece to five native regiments; making (besides young assistant surgeons occasionally doing duty, and a brigade of apothecaries, native dressers, &c.) fourteen commissioned officers for the care of the sick; while the spiritual care both of sick and whole was entrusted to one. It may be added that every station, however small, has its medical officer; while chaplains are only to be found at a few. The total charge of the ecclesiastical establishments throughout India, including the Kirk and the Roman Catholic Church, is stated at 104,816*l.*, a sum not equivalent to the cost of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Calcutta alone.²

¹ For this liberty he affirmed he had the warrant of a large number of 'Evangelical' clergymen in England and Ireland, who had subscribed a paper to the effect that in such cases pious laymen were allowed to administer the 'ordinance' themselves. Among the names stated to be affixed to this 'letter of marque,' was that of one who has since been elevated to the Irish mitre. As might be expected, the officer continued the exercise of his 'Christian liberty' after he had removed into the chaplain's station.

² 'Charges of the Queen's Supreme Court and the other local Courts within its jurisdiction, including law charges (1842-3), *Co.'s Rupees*, 11, 13, 658.' See *Accounts printed by House of Commons*, 10th June, 1845, No. 362. The total

The Bishop of Calcutta is so impressed with the necessity for more chaplains that he has advised a further reduction of salaries to obtain it. But the Indian Exchequer cannot be said to have yet disbursed its due proportion on this account, and any further reduction of salaries is much to be deprecated. At present, Mr. Keane, who was not a chaplain himself, says, 'I think a chaplain the worst paid covenanted servant in the East Indies.' ('Lords' Comm.' *Qu.* 7,938.) Lord Ellenborough would contrast them with clergymen in this country. He might as well contrast the Governor General, receiving his 30,000*l.* a-year, with the President of the India Board in London, receiving 5,000*l.* The true contrast is with the corresponding ranks in the Indian services, and this unquestionably is against the chaplain. An assistant chaplain's stipend is less than a Bengal pilot's. Many civil, military, and medical officers, whose position according to the usages of society is below the clergyman's, exceed him in emolument; and it should be remembered, that while these have staff appointments and high promotion to look to in addition, the clergy have nothing but their stipends. Then they are *resident* functionaries, expected to show hospitality to new comers. In short, Mr. Keane declares that a missionary, with many wants supplied by the Society, voyages home of wife and children paid for, and not liable to the same Indian expenditure, is, 'generally speaking, a more independent man.' He thinks the character of the Establishment has suffered from the late reductions.

'The higher motive of missionary usefulness in a heathen land, which would call forth the ablest men, is not now put before the chaplains. The ecclesiastical establishment seems paid too little, or all the other services far too much.'—*Ibid.* *Qu.* 7,945.

We trust, therefore, that no further reductions will be thought of. At a time when it is proposed to raise still higher the intellectual character of the other services, by introducing public competition into the disposal of writerships and cadetries, it is of the utmost importance not to let the chaplains fall into contempt. We need say no more, however, on this subject, both because the Directors are not at all indisposed to its fair and liberal consideration;¹ and because the adoption of our other propositions would to a great extent supersede the necessity for augmenting their Establishments.

revenues of India exceed seventeen millions, while the total expenses of Government in the country (exclusive of interest on debt) is about fourteen and a half millions, English money.

¹ It is impossible for any Government to be more fair and impartial to its servants of every description than the Court of Directors. If no masters were ever better served, it is equally true that no servants ever possessed kinder or more liberal employers.

We come next to the suggestion of 'grants-in-aid towards the support of clergymen in the smaller English stations;' and to the recommendation of 'Native sub-assistant chaplains to minister to Native Christians connected with the Honourable Company's service.' Taking these propositions together, we must again object to the principle, implied in the latter, of distinguishing between the Company's servants and the rest of the Christian community.

The thing to be arrived at—and arrived at, as we think, more directly and systematically—is the constitution of a local Church. This is obviously uppermost in the thoughts of the least prejudiced witnesses. Mr. Keane says,—

'I long to see India do something herself to perpetuate religious principles among the people. *I think there are ample opportunities for a local Church.*'—*Ibid.* *Qn.* 7,946.

He conceives that,—

'the chaplains ought to go to places where the Company's servants *exclusively* reside, and that the large town congregations should be provided with clergymen paid by themselves. . . . In some instances *endowments* exist or could be found.'—*Ibid.*

We regret to find views so nearly in accordance with our own, crossed by the suggestion to provide for the clergy from 'large fees, minister's money, and pew rents.' These are in no degree better suited to India than to England. Moderate fees upon marriages and burials would be right; but let us hear little of 'minister's money,' fluctuating with the fluctuations of the community, and nothing of pew-rents. Endowments are the only proper course; comprising annual payments, till the end is accomplished, but aiming ultimately and steadily at a fixed property in land. This is the system on which the Government aid should be granted both to bishoprics and vicarages; and no doubt it might be largely assisted, under proper Church regulations, by the resident Europeans.

But to return. Mr. Tucker also points out the necessity for a local church among the Natives. The distinction between pastoral and missionary labour has long forced itself on reflecting minds. A large portion of the Missions have now grown into the parochial condition, where the missionary (as he is still called) has enough to employ his whole time in the care of the Christian village, without attempting further aggressions on the heathen. This has led to the distinction we have just named. The Church Missionary Society is setting out 'pastoral districts' in Tinnevely, which they wish to assign to Native clergymen under the general superintendence of the European Missionary of the district; and they have actually commenced making provision for their endowment:—

'It is our aim to carry out the pastoral system as far as we can, until we

are able to withdraw from Tinnevely, *as not being any longer a sphere for missionary labour, and leave it with the Bishop as a Church to be carried on, in all its operations, in the way in which the Church of England is.*—*Ibid. Qu. 8, 253.*

The Missions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel present of course similar features, though we are not aware that that Society has yet distinctly contemplated any change of system.

We said at the outset of this article, that each of the three Indian organizations of the Church of England contains in itself a genuine Church idea, though none has yet systematically developed it, or sought to unite it with the others. The ideas, then, are plainly these—the English Church—the Native Church—and the Missionary Church. These genuine ecclesiastical aspects,—now obscured by the false distinction between Government servants and others,—must henceforth assume their true prominence under the Bishop and his Chapter.

The first will be embodied by the English vicarages and chaplaincies, the latter being indeed peculiar to government servants, but to such portions only as from frequent change of abode cannot conveniently be parochialized. The last is the chosen province of the Church Missionary Society. Let the middle place be appropriated to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; who, in devoting themselves to the conversion of the Christian villages into parishes, and founding others for the mixed populations of the out-stations, where no chaplain is resident, would possess an irresistible claim to assistance from the Indian revenues. It has been shown both that the proportion allotted to ecclesiastical uses is inadequate, on the principle admitted by the Court of Directors; and that this principle fails to meet their real obligations under the Charter, and the moral responsibilities of Christian governments.¹ Some saving would result from the transfer of the churches and their establishments to the management of the Chapters, as also from replacing the presidency chaplains by vicars, whose endowment would be largely assisted by the inhabitants. The travelling charges also of the chaplains would be diminished by the founding of up-country parishes. So that on every account an abundant claim would exist on the Government to aid in the proposed foundations,—at once providing for duties long neglected, and placing recognised obligations on a more satisfactory footing.

¹ The Indian Government might very possibly consent to convert some of their principal stations up the country into English endowed vicarages, in which case the patronage should lie with them. In other cases they might assist the endowments by grants varying with the circumstances. All endowments to be finally vested in land, and their incumbents, whether bishop, archdeacon, or vicar, to be obliged to learn the Native tongue, on the same principle as ought to prevail in the Welsh dioceses.

We are satisfied that the system now sketched out will be found—the more it is reflected upon—to meet the real necessities of Christian government over a heathen land. Government agency would still be limited to the spiritual care of its own servants.¹ The conversion of the heathen would remain entrusted to organizations wholly unconnected with Government, and deriving no assistance whatever from its treasury, while there would be a third agency, not stipendiaries of the Government nor under its management, but like the heathen and Mahometan sacerdocies employing property originally bestowed by the State in the peaceable culture of an indigenous religion. Finally, all these agencies would be welded into a CHURCH, under the presidency of a canonical Bishop, enjoying, like the supreme courts of judicature, the immediate protection of the Crown and Legislature of England, and wholly devoted to the enlargement and perpetuity of the kingdom of CHRIST in India. If the Gospel be indeed a blessing to mankind, and its institutions the means of regenerating nations no less than individual souls, we know not how any government can acquit itself of its obligations to its subjects, while declining to afford them the means of embracing it. Still less when a portion of the people have been brought to choose the better way, can it be permitted to the representatives of a Christian nation to declare themselves indifferent to the fact, and in order to secure the toleration of error discourage the profession of truth.²

¹ The Chaplains, however, should be obliged to learn the Native languages, like other servants of the State.

² '8,256. Is there any apparent external difference between the districts inhabited by Christians and those inhabited by the heathen?—A most marked difference.

'8,257. In what respect, should you say?—In the habits of the people, in their cleanliness, order, and intelligence; our Christian villages exhibit a very striking and interesting scene, with their church and their cottages behind the rows of trees; and the people, particularly the females, exhibiting a marked difference from the heathen in the neighbourhood.

'8,258. *Earl of Ellenborough.* Do you consider that superiority to have been the cause, or the consequence of their having become Christians?—Entirely the consequence.

'8,259. They were no better than the others at first?—No better than the others, as I can bear witness in the successive visits which I have paid Tinnevely.'—*Rev. J. Tucker, Lords' Report.* Mr. Tucker proceeds to say that a considerable effect is produced upon the social state of the surrounding heathen from the increase of Christianity. 'Devil worship, which was attended with exhibitions of a very disgraceful and shameful kind, is now thrown, so to speak, into the dark. It retreats before the influence of Christianity, where the people still remain heathen, but are ashamed of their former practices.'

Is this a change to which a Government can be indifferent? Why, if Christianity had only extirpated polygamy and placed the female sex in its proper position in the social scale, this alone would have earned it a right to government aid.

The subject of Native Education is too wide to be entered on at the close of an article. We mention it chiefly to extract a remark by Mr. Tucker:—

‘I think it of great importance to take a thoroughly practical view of the whole subject of education, and to avoid theories, which have been perhaps injurious to the progress of education in India.’—*Ibid.* Qu. 8,306.

And again,—

‘I am afraid we have hitherto aimed too high, and have not come down to the means of practically working upon the people at large.’—*Ibid.* Qu. 8,315.

This is the bane of many questions, religious and educational. The high Indian officials, with all their brilliant talent and administrative skill, are often merciless *doctrinaires*. Each has his hobby, and rides it to the death.¹ One system is promulgated at Calcutta, which, coming from the seat of supreme Government, expects to be received everywhere else. But as at Madras they have hit upon a much better system, the subordinate government declines to adopt the other, and is not allowed to carry out its own.

It is the axiom of the *doctrinaires*, that ‘perfect neutrality’ is to be observed by Government towards all religions; and to assert this principle, they polish up the heathen rights of conscience to a surface never imagined by the heathen themselves. The Christian Scriptures must be rigidly excluded from the Government schools, though the Hindoo Rajahs of Travancore and Mysore freely sanction their introduction into schools supported by themselves; and the opinion of the native public is unequivocally demonstrated by the fact, that while the Government schools muster throughout India 25,362 scholars, the Mission schools, where the Scriptures are not only read but avowedly used as an instrument for conversion, number 96,177.

After all, too, this affected neutrality is a mere phantom. To preserve a show of it towards the heathen, the consciences of the 100,000 native Christians are disregarded without scruple, and their children, in consequence, excluded from the Government education. Yet to the heathen themselves it is impossible to impart *any* social education, even on secular subjects, without undermining and disproving their religious tenets. It is well known that the Hindoo sacred books contain a system of physics which can no more endure the light of science than their morals can that of the Gospel. Still the one as well as the other

¹ Perhaps it is a consequence of this error in education that Mr. Keane tells us several civilians have expressed to him the opinion that ‘*high-flown European education* is not the best preparation for useful service in the State,’ ‘the airs of mere highly-taught students’ being ‘as much above, as their qualifications are below, the practical standard of Government employ.’

are essential elements of their religion. Our *doctrinaires*, however, have no remorse in exposing the false astronomy of the Vedas, their geography, chemistry, botany, anatomy, or physiology. It is their spiritual nakedness only that they are so anxious to cover with the mantle of toleration. They have no objection, for instance, to demonstrate to the Hindoo medical student that the human heart does not contain (as the Vedas assert it does) a little mannikin of a thumb's length, which is the whole man in miniature, and goes out at his death by the artery called Shusamna; or that there are not 'a hundred and one arteries issuing from the heart, one of which passes to the crown of the head.' To explode all this is consistent with official 'neutrality.' It is violated only when the truth is suggested, or even brought within reach, that the human being *is* endowed with an immortal spirit responsible to its Almighty Maker, and destined to stand in judgment at the tribunal of His Son. To destroy all faith in Hindooism is permitted; to bring so much as a single stone towards the erection of a better faith in its place, is jealously prohibited. Is it surprising that such a system should be more than suspected of leading to atheism; or that warm-hearted Christians should charge its supporters with 'standing between the Natives and their eternal interests'?

The Missionaries only ask for the admission of the Scriptures into Government Schools, not as a class-book for general use, but for the study of those who choose to learn them. In this demand not only the most experienced European servants of Government, but the most enlightened Native authorities are perfectly agreed with the Missionaries. Surely it is time for the *doctrinaires* to 'move on,' and let the work of practical education go forward.

For the rest, the plan which promises best, is for Government to make grants in aid of all schools that impart a standard amount of secular education; and to transfer to India our system of Training Schools, in order to furnish a proper supply of qualified Teachers. These are deeply interesting questions, and not less so the methods employed by our Missionaries to awaken and permanently impress the native mind. But we must reluctantly defer them to another opportunity.

[Since this article was in type we have learned from *Allen's Indian Mail* that it is likely another See will be founded at Agra, and a small addition be made to the number of chaplains in the Bengal Presidency; accompanied (it is more than hinted) by the substitution of seventeen for fifteen years' service to entitle to the retiring pension. These concessions, satisfactory

so far as they go, are announced in an article full of the low and imperfect conception of the episcopal office which has too long prevailed at the India House. The authorities of that noble Establishment have often shown themselves second to no other statesmen in breadth of political views, and in courage to carry their conclusions into action. They have freed themselves, also, from many terrors and prejudices which once clouded their sagacity in matters of religion. When will they apply their wonted intelligence to realize the manifold advantages of a *genuine* Episcopate, in developing energies to which statesmen can never be indifferent, though governments and armies can neither elicit nor direct them?]

ART. III.—*Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria.* By GEORGE DENNIS. London: John Murray. 1848.

IN these days of 'Handbooks' and easy travelling, classical inquiries are every year gaining popularity: and topics which half a century ago were confined to the antiquarian or the scholar, have now little reason to complain of the want of public sympathy, if presented in a tolerably attractive form. A happy effort of enterprise redeemed from the sleep of ages *Herculaneum* and *Pompeii*: and the genius of *Bulwer*, faithful to antiquity without pedantry, soon filled with glowing images of the past the tenantless mansions of the Cities of the Dead. Instantly the theme of his story fascinated the public eye. Several years afterwards the discovery of the Etruscan tombs opened a new page in the history of nations. The wonderful immunity from decay enjoyed, notwithstanding the lapse of ages, by these brilliant sepulchral portraiture of ancient civilization, entranced that numerous class of our fellow-countrymen whom every summer sends to roam over the fair domains of *Tuscany* and the *Papal States*.

We must preface that it is not our intention to delay the reader with any disquisition upon that hitherto insoluble enigma, the origin of the Etruscan race. The existing materials for such a discussion have already been exhausted in two elaborate essays in the *Quarterly Review*: and, since Mr. Dennis's publication, no fresh light has been thrown upon the language, the only satisfactory key to the extraction of the people. Not, however, from any want of antiquarian zeal. Independently of the three classic tongues, the *Ethiopic*, the *Egyptian*, the *Arabic*, the *Coptic*, the *Chinese*, the *Celtic*, the *Basque*, the *Anglo-Saxon*, the *Teutonic* and the *Runic* have been ransacked in vain. We have, however, every expectation of enlightenment from a chapter on '*Etruria*,' promised by the *Chevalier Bunsen*, in his forthcoming work upon the '*Philosophy of Languages*.' The latest results of comparative philology upon this mysterious question will be there collectively reviewed; including, we believe, the results of Dr. *Freund's* recent mission from the *Berlin Academy of Science* to *Rhætia*, in the course of which he discovered from 1,000 to 1,500 words irreducible to *Celtic*, *Germanic*, or *Romaic* roots. The adoption of this branch of research by a scholar of European celebrity will be hailed as a happy augury of success by the lovers of Etruscan

antiquity; and we shall hope to present to our readers the fruits of his Excellency's learned labours, as soon as they issue from the press.

Mrs. Hamilton Gray's contributions to the study of Etruscan Archaeology undoubtedly deserved their popularity. That lady had the merit of introducing Etruria to the notice of English travellers, and of lending fascination, by the graces of a lively and imaginative style, to a subject unattractive to the general reader. But the value of her labours to the learned world was impaired by numerous defects, both positive and negative, which it has been the task of a subsequent author to remedy and supply. Want of sound scholarship and research threw her unreservedly open to the strong Transalpine prejudices of the Italian literati, to whose bigoted dictates she passively surrendered; her inquiries, too, were partial in their scope: many sites of high interest she left untouched: to say nothing of the later discoveries at Veii, Vetulonia, and Sovana, which we shall presently describe, and which invest Mr. Dennis's pages with attractions of their own. Many of her descriptions were written, not from notes registered on the spot, but from memory, by her own fireside, and can plead no exemption from inaccuracy,¹ the usual fate of such performances. Unfamiliar, too, with classical usages and manners, she is frequently by no means a reliable interpreter of scenes depicted on the walls of those venerable tombs. An instance of this occurs in her delineation of the Grotta Querciola at Tarquinii, where, in spite of the evident amorous *abandon* of a fair Etruscan reclining on the festive couch, marking the *hetæra* to the scholar's eye, Mrs. Gray discerns in the figure only 'an afflicted mother consoled by her remaining son.'

Mr. Dennis's pretensions to fill the vacant field are assuredly of no ordinary character. Long distinguished as a contributor to the journals of the Archæological Institute at Rome, he has combined with deep classical and antiquarian lore a gallant spirit of adventurous enterprise, and a warm sensibility to the beauties of Italian scenery, which cannot fail to recommend his brilliant panoramas to all the votaries of Nature in that glorious land. Unlike his fellow-countrymen, who rarely depart, in search of antiquities, from high-roads and beaten tracks, he emulates the classic zeal which proved fatal to Müller in Bœotia: often, as he tells us, reclining on the top of a tomb, with his body hanging half over its face, clinging for support to some projection of the rock, or some friendly bough, while he endea-

¹ Witness the plate portraying the paintings in the Grotta del Triclinio at Tarquinii, very indifferent in fidelity of outline, and incorrect in colour throughout.

vours to *feel* his way through some inscription or relief: spending whole weeks among the tombs of Tarquinii, and plunging, without even the luxury of a guide, into the lone and devious wilds of the Maremma, unappalled alike by its reputed pestilential air, and the prospect of sleepless nights and the coarsest fare in some villanous *osteria*. In his work—the fruit of several Italian tours between the years 1842 and 1847—he had at first projected the unambitious design of a Guide to those who would become personally acquainted with the extant remains of Etruscan civilization. But the reader will not regret that, in the course of execution, the author soon overstepped the modest limits of a Handbook, thereby converting his volumes into a valuable repository of classical and antiquarian knowledge; while his original aim has been redeemed by specific information on routes and conveyances, and the relative merit of inns, always depreciated in cheapness and comfort wherever the main stream of English travellers has flowed. His promised volumes on Sicily, if characterised by a similar spirit, must needs prove an acceptable supplement to the meagre lucubrations of Capt. Smith and St. Non on that unexplored yet not uninteresting region.

Independently, then, of those more recent discoveries which might fairly claim some notice at our hands, apology, we trust, can scarcely be needful for the subject of the following pages. And we shall gladly embrace the opportunity to touch upon a few salient problems of Etruscan institutions, both social and religious, which have not, perhaps, as yet met with all the attention they deserve: to indicate the actual state of knowledge and research in this province of ancient lore: and to point to the numerous veins in the vast classical mine, still fruitful in the promise of virgin ore to antiquarian enterprise and learning.

If one circumstance pleads more strongly than another in favour of the adoption of those researches by our own countrymen, it is the mercenary Vandalism so prevalent in Italy, wherever the fate of antiquities is concerned.

‘If,’ says Mr. Dennis, ‘a relic of antiquity be convertible into cash, whether by sale or by exhibition, it meets with due attention; but when this is not the case, nobody cares to preserve it—the very terms in which it is mentioned are those of contempt—it is *il pontaccio*, or *le maraccia*, and worth nothing: though, if it can be turned to any account, however base, the most hoary antiquity will avail it nought. Stones are torn from the spots they have occupied eighteen or twenty centuries, where they served as corroborations of history, as elucidations of national customs, as evidences of long-extinct civilization, and as landmarks to the antiquary—they are torn thence for conversion to some vile purpose of domestic or general convenience. Surely governments which profess to reverence memorials of the past should put a stop to such barbarous spoliations and perversions, or the ancient ways will ere long be untraceable, save by the

Itineraries of Antoninus or Theodosius, or by the records of modern archaeologists.'—Vol. i. p. 77.

We cannot, of course, expect to enlist in antiquarian and classical pursuits those among the English visitors to the Eternal City who seem determined to transplant the pleasures of Melton and Ascot to the Italian soil: whose fondest triumph it is to startle the august and solemn scene with their races and fox-hunts, 'awakening unwonted clamours among the sepulchres of the Appian Way, and the ruined aqueducts of the Campagna.' But there are not wanting among us spirits kindred to those of Layard, Fellowes, Curzon, Gell: spirits bent on venturous enterprise and exciting discovery: and only deterred by the fallacious, yet far from uncommon belief, that Italy is a country so thoroughly beaten by travellers, that it no longer offers a fair hope of novelty in research.

'Yet the truth is,' says our author, 'that vast districts of the peninsula, especially the Tuscan, Roman, and Neapolitan States, are to the archaeologist a *terra incognita*. Every monument on the high roads is familiar, even to the fireside traveller; but how little is known of the bye-ways! Of the swarms of travellers who yearly traverse the country between Florence and Rome, not one in a hundred leaves the beaten track to visit objects of antiquity. Now and then an excursion is made to Chiusi; or a few may run from Civita Vecchia to Corneto, to visit the painted tombs; but not a tithe of that small number continue their route to Vulci or Toscanella—still fewer to Cosa. Parties occasionally make a picnic to the site of Veii; but, considering the proximity to Rome, the convenience of transit, and the intense interest of the spot, the number is very limited.

'The wide district on the frontiers of the Tuscan and Roman States is so rarely trodden by the foot of a traveller, even of an antiquary, that it can be no matter of surprise that relics of ancient art should exist there, utterly unknown to the world; gazed at only with stupid astonishment by the peasantry, or else more stupidly unheeded. In a country almost depopulated by malaria, inhabited only by shepherds and husbandmen, the most striking monuments may remain for ages unnoticed. Thus it was with the magnificent temples of Pæstum. Though they had reared their mighty columns to the sunbeams for at least three-and-twenty centuries, isolated in an open plain where they were visible for many a league, and standing on the sea-shore, where they must have served for ages as a landmark to the mariner; yet their very existence had been forgotten by the world, till in the middle of the last century a Neapolitan painter discovered them afresh, rescuing them from an oblivion of fifteen hundred years.'—Vol. i. p. 481.

But surely the valuable discoveries at Veii, Vetulonia, and Sovana,—all made since Mrs. Gray's visit to Etruria,—to which we will now invite the reader's attention, will supply a powerful incentive to fresh investigation.

The greater part of the land around Veii, once the mightiest of Etruscan cities, belongs to the Queen of Sardinia, who lets it out in the season to excavators, mostly dealers in antiquities at

Rome, who rifle the tombs of everything convertible into cash, and cover them in immediately with earth. The solitary tomb which remains open in this Necropolis, was discovered in the winter of 1842-3; it is the property of an antiquary renowned for his excellent taste, the Cavaliere Campana, whose well-known liberality has made it accessible to every traveller, with its relics and furniture inviolate. Its virgin fame, its unique character, its preeminent antiquity, coeval, in Cavaliere Campana's opinion, with the birth of Rome, entitle it to a more detailed notice than space will allow us for its sister tombs. The extraordinary paintings on the inner wall at once arrest the traveller's eye, to the exclusion of the vast jars and articles of bronze, lying on benches or standing on the floor.

'Were there ever,' asks Mr. Dennis, 'more strangely devised, more grotesquely designed figures? Was there ever such a harlequin scene as this? Here is a horse with legs of the most undesirable length and tenuity, chest and quarters far from meagre, but a barrel pinched in like a lady's waist. His colour is not to be told in a word—as Lord Tolumnus' chestnut colt, or Mr. Vibenna's bay gelding. His neck and forehead are red, with yellow spots—his head black—mane and tail yellow—hind-quarters and near-leg black—near fore-leg corresponding with his body, but off-legs yellow, spotted with red. His groom is in deep-red livery—that is, he is naked, and such is the colour of his skin. A boy of similar complexion bestrides the horse, and another man precedes him, bearing a hammer, or perhaps a double-headed axe, upon his shoulder; while on the croup crouches a tailless cat, parti-coloured like the steed, with one paw familiarly resting on the boy's shoulder. Another beast, similar in character, but with a dog's head, stands beneath the horse.'—Vol. i. p. 51.

Other parts of the wall are chequered with similar devices, strongly resembling the animals represented on the most archaic vases in quaintness and peculiarity of form, and probably imbued with some mystic or symbolic import; for the boys on horseback may fairly be supposed to be emblems of the passage of the soul into another state of existence, from the acknowledged prevalence of the type on cinerary urns of the later style, and the figure with the threatening hammer seemingly portrays the Etruscan Charon. It is probably one of the earliest efforts of native Etruscan art: for, though the stiffness of the figures and the rigidity of the outline forcibly remind us of Egyptian paintings, the features, unlike those in the Tarquinian sepulchres, do not present any of the peculiarities of the Coptic race: the sphinx is not Egyptian, for it is winged: and the ornamental border of lotus flowers, emblematic of immortality, is the only element in the scene suggestive of the Nile.

The relics of a city which Mr. Dennis, in common with many of the leading antiquaries at Rome, both German and Italian, identifies with the site of the lost Vetulonia, were discovered by Signor Pasquinelli, in May 1842, while he was forming a road

from Magliano to the Saline, at the mouth of the Albegna. The ground on the line of the projected route being low and swampy, and the higher land being a soft friable tufa, the engineer was at a loss for materials, till he chanced to uncover some large blocks beneath the surface, easily recognised as the foundations of an ancient wall. He found them range in an unbroken line, which readily enabled him to trace out the periphery of a city between four and five miles in circuit. The site was evidently Etruscan, for neither statues nor marble columns, as among Roman ruins, were discovered: but the relics were chiefly bronze and pottery, especially the common black ware of Chiusi and Volterra: among others, a lion of *peperino*, a little bronze idol with a sickle in his hand, all of the most archaic style, and a venerable packing needle, with eye and point uninjured, which had possibly served some Etruscan worthy in preparing for his travels to the Fanum Voltumnæ, the Parliament of the Lucumones. The characteristics of the site certainly correspond with the requisites of the classic Vetulonia far more closely than Castiglione Bernardi, the spot assigned by Inghirami and Ambrosch, fourteen or fifteen miles from the sea. It is described by the writers of antiquity, and especially by Silius Italicus, as a city of great power and magnificence, with strong claims to rank among the Twelve: with hot springs in its neighbourhood, which Mr. Dennis thinks he has recognised in those at Telamonaccio, two or three hundred yards only from the sea. And, above all, its maritime character, implied by Pliny, and established by a monument,¹ discovered at Cervetri, in 1840, harmonises with the position of the ruins on the first heights that rise above the level of the marine swamp, nearly at the same distance from the port of Telamone as Tarquinii lies from its harbour Gravisca—a position which indicates a compromise between security and convenience: for, apart from maritime purposes, the founders would surely have built further inland, at once for the sake of a stronger site, and for greater elevation above the insalubrious atmosphere of the Maremma.

Several painted tombs have been opened in the neighbour-

¹ A bas-relief, bearing the devices of three Etruscan cities—Tarquinii, Vulci, and Vetulonia. The latter, which is indicated by the inscription, *Vetulonenses*, is symbolised by a naked man with an oar on his shoulder, and holding a pine-cone, which he seems to have just plucked from a tree over his head. Dr. Braun, the learned Secretary of the Archaeological Institute, says—‘That this figure represents Neptune, seems to me beyond a doubt; it is shown not only by the attribute in his hand, but also by the tree, sacred to that Deity, which stands at his side. However this may be, no one can presume to deny that the figure bearing an oar indicates a maritime city, such as Pliny in truth implies Vetulonia to have been. —Dennis, vol. i. p. 303.

hood, and, as usual, have since been re-closed with earth, when once rifled of their treasures. There is, doubtless, much to invite excavators to the spot.

The accidental discovery of the sepulchral curiosities at Sovana, and of the relics imbedded for ages in the Lake of Falterona, near Florence, only multiply the inducements to further research. The former were disclosed to the antiquarian world in the spring of 1842, by Mr. Ainsley, our author's enterprising fellow-traveller, who, on exploring the surrounding ravines, detected a long range of tombs with rock-hewn façades like those of Norchia and Castel d'Asso: only that they were unique in combining the characteristics of remote ages and countries — of Egypt, Greece, Etruria and Rome — with a prodigal variety elsewhere unknown. The novel and striking features peculiar to the site invest the discovery with special interest and importance; but we will not fatigue the reader with their details, which are fully developed in the twenty-sixth chapter of Mr. Dennis's first volume. It is, however, only fair to warn him of the perils which the traveller must encounter in a visit to the spot. So dense are the tangled thickets that Mr. Ainsley was compelled to get the peasants to pioneer him a way from one monument to another with their wood-bills: the slopes are furrowed with yawning pits: and the ground is kept moist and slippery with the overhanging foliage, so that a false step would, in a double sense, prove a step into the grave. But a subtler foe lurks in the *malaria*, which year by year stalks through this skeleton of former greatness. Along its silent street reigns a monotonous death-like calm: its houses are mostly ruined and tenantless: even on a fête-day, during the healthy season, scarcely a soul, says Mr. Dennis, was visible, and the few who met his eye had hardly energy even for wonder at the novel apparition of a stranger.

But perhaps the most singular discovery was that made in the summer of 1838, in the Lake of Monte Falterona, one of the loftiest of the Tuscan mountains, whence the Arno takes its rise, and from whose summit, says Ariosto, both seas are visible. Here we must allow our author to tell his own story:—

‘On the same level with the source of the Arno is a lake, on whose banks a shepherdess, sauntering in dreamy mood, chanced to cast her eye on something sticking in the soil. It proved to be a little figure in bronze. She carried it home: and taking it in her simplicity for the image of some holy man of God, set it up in her hut to aid her private devotions. The parish priest, paying a pastoral visit, observed this mannikin, and inquired what it was. “A saint,” replied the girl; but, incredulous of its sanctity, he carried it away with him. The fact got wind in the neighbourhood of Stia del Casentino, and some of the inhabitants agreed to make researches on the spot. A single day sufficed to bring to light a quantity of such

images and other articles in bronze, lying confusedly on the shores of the lake, just beneath the surface. They then proceeded to drain the lake, and discovered in its bed a prodigious quantity of trunks of fir and beech trees, with their roots uppermost, as if they had been overthrown by some mighty convulsion of nature; and on them lay many similar figures in bronze. They were mostly human figures of both sexes, many of them of gods and penates, varying in size from two or three to seventeen inches in height. But how came they here? was the question which puzzled every one to answer. At first, it was thought they had been cast into the lake for preservation, during some political convulsion, or invasion, and afterwards forgotten. But further examination proved them to be chiefly of a votive character—offerings at some shrine, for favours expected or received. Most of them had their arms extended, as if in the act of presenting gifts; others were clearly representations of beings suffering from disease, especially one who had a wound in his chest, and a frame wasted by consumption or atrophy: and there were, moreover, a number of decided *ex-votos*—heads and limbs and various portions of the human body: beside many images of domestic animals, also of a votive character. All this implied the existence of a shrine on the mountain, surrounded, as the trees seemed to indicate, by a sacred grove, like that of Feronia or Soracte, and of Silvanus at Cære; and it seemed that, by one of those terrible convulsions to which this land has from age to age been subject, the shrine and grove had been hurled down into this cavity of the mountain. It is well known that such catastrophes have in past ages occurred in Monte Falterona. No traces, however, of a shrine, or of any habitation, were discovered with the relics in this lake. . . . There were some articles of very different character mixed with these figures, the existence of which, on such a site, was still more difficult to explain. Such were fragments of knives and swords, and the heads of darts, all of iron, in great numbers, not less, it is said, than two thousand; besides great chains, and *fibulae*, with fragments of the better known coinage.—Vol. ii. pp. 109, 110.

We are indebted to the author for the following account of the solution of this mystery, proposed by Dr. Emil Braun, the learned Secretary of the Archæological Institute at Rome:—

‘He (Dr. Braun) observes that the trees found in the lake had been completely deprived of vitality, the water having absorbed all the resinous parts which they possessed when green. He considers that the convulsion or dislocation of the mountain, which hurled them into this spot, must have occurred long prior to the period when the bronzes and other articles were here deposited, otherwise the latter would have been buried beneath the former, and not regularly set around the lake. He thinks that the lake was formed at the time when the landslip occurred, and that its waters acquired a medicinal quality from the trees it contained, the parts which gave them that virtue being identical with those from which modern chemistry extracts creosote. Now, the diseases which are shown in the *ex-votos* are just such, he observes, as are remediable by that medicine. The styptic water of Pinelli, so celebrated for stopping the hæmorrhage of recent wounds, has a base of creosote; and hither, it seems, flocked crowds of wounded warriors, who left their weapons in acknowledgment of their cure. The virtues of the same medicine, in curing the attacks of phthisis, are now recognised by medical men of every school; and by patients labouring under this disorder the lake seems to have been especially frequented. Creosote also is a specific against numerous diseases to which the fair sex is subject: and such appear, from the figures, to have resorted

in crowds to these waters. To free his theory from the charge of caprice or fantasy, the learned doctor cites the case of a similar lake in China, which is known to have imbibed marvellous medicinal qualities from the trunks of trees casually immersed in its waters.'—Vol. ii. p. 112.

The bronzes thus discovered, several of which are now open to inspection in the British Museum,¹ illustrate the manifold variations of Etruscan art, from the rude efforts of its infancy to the era of perfection under Greek influence.

But one of the most singular monuments of antiquity—the tomb of Porsena, has yet to be reclaimed. It is the only Etruscan sepulchre described by any classical writer, and is thus portrayed in Pliny's quotation from Varro:—

'Porsena was buried under the city of Clusium, in a spot where he has left a monument in rectangular masonry, each side whereof is three hundred feet wide, and fifty high, and within the square of the basement is an inextricable labyrinth, out of which no one who ventures in without a clue of thread can ever find an exit. On that square basement stand five pyramids, four at the angles, and one in the centre, each seventy-five feet wide at its base, and one hundred and fifty high, and all terminating above so as to support a brazen circle and a *pelorus*, from which are hung by chains certain bells, which, when stirred by the wind, resound afar, as was formerly the case at Dodona. Upon this circle four other pyramids are based, each rising to the height of one hundred feet. And above these, from one floor, five more pyramids, whose height Varro was ashamed to mention. Etruscan legends declare it to have been equal to that of the rest of the edifice. What insane extravagance, to hunt for glory at a lavish expense that can profit no man!'

The reader will hardly require to be told that the whole story was immediately condemned by Niebuhr as a shadowy illusion—'a building totally inconceivable, save as the work of magic'—a visionary phantom, like Aladdin's palace. Müller, on the contrary, argues that the precision of Varro's statement betrays a more reliable source than mere tradition: and Orioli, adopting with Mr. Dennis a more reasonable ground of criticism, and refusing to believe that 'a monument could have been traditional had it not been characteristic,' infers that Varro's description must not only have been consonant with the Etruscan style of architecture, but drawn from a real object, just as the ideal palaces of Ariosto and Tasso had evidently their Italian originals. Apart from the legitimate presumption that a magnificent tomb was raised to the majestic shade of

¹ This institution is rich in the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, but poor in its collection of Etruscan relics. The Vase room is the best, but the bronze department is a very hungry affair: we see no specimens of the exquisite jewellery and gold filagree-work, which in foreign Museums are still the pride of Etruria. And the fac-similes of sepulchral paintings are very partial, exhibiting, with only one exception, convivial and athletic scenes, to the exclusion of all others.

Lars Porsena, whose prestige inspired terror even into Rome, and that the site of such a monument would naturally be Clusium, his capital, it is surely no vain credulity to repose with our author on the argument from analogy. He remarks that the square basement of regular masonry, supporting five pyramids, exists not only in the Varronian picture, but in the well-known sepulchre on the Appian Way at Albano; and that the Cucumella of Vulci, with its walled basement and pair of towers, square and conical, and its Lydian cousin, the Royal tomb of Sardis, with its diadem of five termini, though both have a circular basement, bear a strong affinity to the legendary monument. But the distinguishing feature of Porsena's tomb was the Labyrinth, numerous analogies to which are presented by existing relics. Situated within the basement, it was probably subterranean,¹ and also excavated in the rock, so that traces of it would not be easily effaced. A few years ago many antiquaries imagined they had revealed it to the world in the excavations made on the hill Poggio Gabella, about three miles to the north-east of Chiusi, which proved to be an isolated City of the Dead; characterised not only by the ordinary fence of walls and fosse, the decorations and furniture of the living in the abodes of the departed, and distinct lines of terraces, but by an extraordinary net-work of labyrinthine passages, meandering in tortuous channels with the most capricious irregularity both of height, form, breadth and level. Inability to surmise the design of these mysterious alleys ought not to induce us hastily to identify the hill with the site of the long-lost tomb. Several circumstances point to an opposite conclusion. The fact that one of the passages opens just beneath the ceiling, destroying the beauty of the walls, which were painted with dancing figures, and that another cuts through one of the rock-hewn couches; their extreme tenuity, which makes it difficult to thread them on all-fours, and their manifold irregularities, especially of level, seem to authenticate the suspicion that they were mostly formed in bygone researches for concealed treasure. The chips of broken pottery and urns, and the condition in which the magnificent Vase of the Judgment of Paris, now the gem of the Casuccini Collection, was found, broken into a hundred and twenty minute fragments, clearly betray the violations past ages have witnessed in the tomb. The inference is strengthened by the discrepancy of the basement, circular instead of square; and the comparatively late date of its decorations and contents conspires to argue a less ambitious origin for these chambers of

¹ We beg pardon of Mrs. H. Gray, who summarily decides that it *must* have been above ground, and that this was the reason of the disappearance of the monument.

the dead. But the votaries of classical research will do well to explore the recesses of another hill, called Poggio di San Paoli, not far off, long marked by tradition as the depository of ancient treasure, and by fragments of massive masonry as the basement of a sepulchral tumulus. We trust to their energy to overcome the scruples entertained against excavation by its present proprietor, one of the Canons: who perhaps may still catch the spirit of those members of his own Church, under whose auspices fresh investigations into the remnants of Italian antiquity have lately been undertaken at Rome.

In one who has devoted so many years of patient and enterprising research to the elucidation of a favourite subject, casual excesses of enthusiasm are assuredly a pardonable fault. But the zeal with which he labours to elevate his darling Etruria in the scale of nations cannot excuse the invidious depreciation of her mighty conqueror, implied by the author's assertion that Rome, before her intercourse with Greece, 'was indebted to Etruria for almost everything which tended to exalt her as a nation, save her stern virtues, her love of conquest, her indomitable courage, which were peculiarly her own; for verily *her sons were mighty with little else than the sword.*'—

———— Stolidum genus
Bellipotentis magi quàm sapientipotentis.

Nothing can be a more vulgar or superficial error than that conceived in the words we have italicised. Doubtless, the Roman character, in common with that of the noblest races of antiquity, was clearly—may we not say, providentially?—impressed with a distinct and peculiar type. Indeed, the more strongly-defined characteristics of ancient nationality may safely be ranked among the salient points of contrast between ancient and modern civilization. But Mr. Dennis entirely mistakes the idiosyncrasy of Rome. Though almost every inch of her vast territory was won by the sword, consolidation was with her ever a more important task than aggrandizement; if she appropriated by conquest, she gave fixity by legislation: she incorporated the whole framework of civilized antiquity by a communion of laws, language, and institutions; and she has left an immortal legacy to the nations of Europe in her civil code, which survived alike the crash of the imperial system, and the anarchical turbulence of barbarism, to form the common law of almost every continental state, and, by the tardy confession of our ablest lawyers,¹ to constitute by far the most valuable

¹ The vast obligations of our Chancery system, and, in some degree, of our Common Law, to the Roman law, have been recently illustrated in great detail in the learned work of Mr. Spence, 'On the Equitable Constitution of the Court of Chancery.' They were very inadequately acknowledged, because very imperfectly understood, by Blackstone.

portion of the equitable jurisprudence of that remote and barbarian isle—our own Britain—which the Imperial Roman shivered as he named.’

In the same vein, alike in the teeth of antecedent probability and recorded evidence, the author claims for Etruria ‘the possession of a national literature—histories, tragedies, and ‘poems: besides religious and ritual books.’ (Introd. lvii.) It is more than doubtful if Etruscan letters ever rose above the sober level of the Carthaginian muse, whose sole heirloom to posterity consisted of a logbook of Hanno’s voyage, and a manual of practical husbandry. One solitary tragedian, Volnius, apparently a late writer, whose aim was the revival of an expiring language, redeemed from the night of oblivion by the indefatigable antiquarian Varro,¹ alone sustains the dignity of the Tuscan buskin. Polybius,² indeed, mentions ‘Annals of the Etruscan dynasties,’ but not in terms which render us inconsolable for their loss. They would hardly have been suffered to die had they been of any literary value, and would probably only have been *materials*, like the Pontifical Records, for the annals of a Greek or Roman author. The poetical fame of Etruria Mr. Denais unhappily reposes on the Fescennine rusticities, which, however, we must believe, with Horace, quite unequal to the load: to say nothing of the circumstance which Niebuhr³ might have taught our author, that the town from which the Fescennine dialogue took its name belonged to the Faliscans, *not* to the Etruscans. It is singular that, if Etruria was indeed a mother of poets, not a single Etruscan inscription betrays the semblance of a verse. So far from being rich in native legendary lore, such was her poverty of heroic lays, that, as we constantly observe in the scenes and devices of the painted vases, she was compelled to naturalise Greek myths. We have, however, no wish to dispute the authenticity of their ‘Ritual Works:’ and as little to deny the accuracy of the Roman estimate thereof, couched in the pithy sarcasm of Cato, so happily rescued by Bentley⁴ from the stupid perversion of his sceptical antagonist, ‘Miror quòd non rideat haruspex, haruspicem aspiciens.’

To ascertain, however, the true rank of Etruria in the scale of ancient civilization, let us briefly review the prominent features of her religion, arts, manners, and social institutions.

Few questions connected with antiquity require so delicate a discrimination; few are so pregnant with illustration at once of moral character and national affinity, as the idiosyncracies of Paganism. In what field of historical criticism has the noble

¹ De Lingua Latinâ, v. 55. Cf. Merivale’s Roman Emperors, vol. ii. p. 490.

² ii. 17.

³ Vol. i. p. 136, third edition.

⁴ Remarks on Freethinking, p. 434.

spirit of the leading nations of the old world been so ignorantly condemned by the flippancy of modern conceit?—which, with habitual modesty and depth, lays to the account of sheer prejudice principles of policy founded upon the highest moral and religious grounds. A signal instance of this has lately been presented to the world in the impertinent parade of a writer, who, if he had but confined his researches to their true province, the exposition of the financial and trading arrangements of Mr. Bull, need never have compromised his fame. In his last publication,¹ Mr. J. R. McCulloch has condescended to survey Phœnician, Greek, and Roman commerce: and informs us that the Athenians despised commercial and mechanical employments *because* they committed them to slaves; that the Roman preference of agriculture to trade was sheer bigotry; and that the solemn warnings of ancient philosophy and history against the luxury and demoralisation to which commercial states were peculiarly incident, are ‘apparently lofty, but really narrow and illiberal prejudices.’ We trust Mr. Mill will not fail to enlist the first of these truly learned and logical statements in the chapter on ‘Fallacies’ in the next edition of ‘Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive,’ for we imagine it might fairly be presumed by the most illiterate that, if the Athenians committed artisanship and retail trade to slaves, it was because they disdained them as menial avocations, and not *vice versa*. His calumnies against Roman and Athenian philosophers and statesmen admit of a very easy solution. Their encouragement of agriculture in preference to trade, as the occupation of their fellow-countrymen, was founded upon a deliberate conviction of its relative moral tendencies. That conviction was sustained by causes some of which are still in operation, while others were limited to the social system of the ancient world. The fall had introduced an element of disharmony into all the relations of man, whether to his Creator, or to his fellow-creatures. A consequence of this disharmony was the breach of the natural law of universal love and sympathy, the providential remedy for which we recognise in that partial law of association, which, while it intensified patriotism and the feeling of a common life in the members of individual states, intensified also the vital distinctions of religion, race, and law. Within a very limited geographical area, how wonderfully diversified are the customs, the institutions, the religion of the several states of Greece! No wonder that Dicaearchus found the illustration of national characteristics so fertile a theme! So strong was the tendency towards political isolation, (assisted, doubtless, but not created,

¹ Treatises on Economical Policy, by J. R. McCulloch. Edinb. 1853.

by the physical configuration of Hellas,) that when a Greek stepped across his frontier, though he was perhaps only twenty or thirty miles from his own metropolis, he found himself in a domain where protection for life and property could only be secured him by virtue of a previous covenant, either special to himself, or shared in by the city of his birth. It was thus that Paganism—in its genius, on the one hand, of exclusion, on the other, of intense nationality within a narrow circle—in the partiality of its types and forms—offers a singular contrast to the great Catholic attribute of Christianity.

The bond of race was originally all-powerful: but the distinctions of race were not ‘distinctions without a difference.’ Each race adored its own Divinities: and the widely diversified attributes of those Divinities variously presented a moral or an immoral image to public veneration. What a contrast between the soft voluptuousness of the Grecian creed, the enormities of the Oriental Bacchanalia, or the mysteries of Isis, and the pure but stern theology of the Latin and Sabine ancestors of Rome! Again, civil institutions and positive law were among the ancients a very important source of public and private morality; practices held infamous in one state were encouraged by the lawgiver in another. With such antecedent probability, we need hardly quote at length the pregnant testimonies of Aristotle and Cicero to the truth, that the promiscuous influx of foreigners—inevitable in a great commercial state—with foreign institutions and foreign creeds, ‘tended,’ in the words of the *liberal* Dr. Arnold,¹ ‘to confuse all the relations of life, and all men’s notions of right and wrong,’ so that the civilization which was the fruit of commerce went hand in hand with degeneracy. It is on these grounds that Aristotle² deprecates a maritime site for his Utopian city, while Cicero³ ascribes the stability of Rome to her inland position, and his countrymen’s agricultural tastes, in contrast with the character and fate of those great representatives of ancient trade, Carthage and Corinth, and the Isles of Greece, whose institutions and morals, he says, were as truly afloat on the waves of eternal change as the isles themselves on the waters of the Ægean.

With this necessary protest against a not uncommon confusion of the cardinal distinctions of Pagan religion into one unvarying type of Heathenism, we will enter on a brief examination of the Etruscan creed. The standards whereby it may fairly be weighed are probably the comparative clearness with which it

¹ Pref. to Thucyd. vol. iii.

² Pol. vii. 6. Becker. Τὸ γὰρ ἐπιξενουῖσθαι τινὰς ἐν ἄλλοις τετραμμένους νόμοις ἀσέμφορον εἶναι πρὸς τὴν εὐνομίαν καὶ τὴν πολυανθρωπίαν, κ.τ.λ.

³ De Republ. ii. 4.

realized the ideas of immortality, of future retribution, of the nature of good and evil, and of the moral taint of sin; also, the character and attributes of its Deities, and its influence on the manners, the art, and the general intellect of the people. The question, of course, is purely relative, and can only be discussed in connexion with other religious systems of antiquity. Our space, however, will only allow us to indulge in a very cursory review thereof.

Amid wild delusion, barbaric rites, and grotesque superstitions, the East has from the earliest ages been the repository of scattered rays of eternal truth, whose radiance, though distorted and obscured, oftentimes exhibits Oriental religion in honourable contrast with the levity of Greece. Ages before the rise of Athenian genius and the spread of Roman civilization, the great doctrines of the immortality of the soul and of a future state of rewards and punishments were acknowledged and diffused by the swarthy sages of the Nile, and the Sacerdotal Princes of Tarquinii. The Homeric conception of the dead is thoroughly unspiritual: with the relaxation of the sinews and the exhaustion of the blood are dried up at once the springs of life and the immaterial essence of the soul; shadowy phantom forms, robbed of the joys alike of sense and intellect, feebly flutter in sunless gloom on the Stygian shore. We can easily sympathise with the offer of Achilles, so strongly reprobated by Plato, to exchange the sovereignty of the realms of Hades for a menial craft on earth. The most atrocious of criminals are but pelted with the soft roses of poetical 'justice;' far from being their awarded sentence as they pass the gates of Death, their Tartarean tortures only symbolise their deeds in life. Minos is a judge amongst the Shades, *because* he was a judge among the living; and Orion chases the shadows of the beasts his darts had stricken in Ortygian groves. The perils and temptations of life were no scene of probation to the heroes of Hesiod; they were the Children of the Gods, and in right of their race divine they bask in Elysian shades. Either in the natural development of ideas, or beneath the influence of Oriental tradition, this crude philosophy was gradually refined: and the glorious imagination of Pindar aspires beyond the vague scenes of the mythical picture to the ethical conception of diversified stages of retribution and reward. Plato recognised a triple sphere of futurity, the bliss of Paradise, the woes of Tartarus, and an intermediate state, which forestalled and probably suggested the purgatory of the Romanists; and the Virgilian portraiture, both of the functions of Minos¹ and the destinies of the dead, is

¹ *Nec verò hæc sine sorte dator, sine iudice sedes:*

Quæsitur Minos urnam movet; ille silentum

Conciliunqve vocat, vitasque et crimina discit.—Æn. vi. 429,

Cf. Hom. Od. λ'. 567.

drawn from the canvas and inspired by the genius of that master-spirit of antiquity.

The Egyptian custom of embalmment is plausibly referred by Servius to the gross materialism of the popular creed, which believed the soul to be capable of retaining its powers only while the body was preserved from decay. Hence the elaborate care with which they sought in the abodes of the dead to revive and perpetuate the scenes of life; convinced, says Diodorus, that while the realms of earth were only a temporary home, the tomb was the destined habitation of man for ages. Between this conception and the doctrine of Metempsychosis, which, according to Herodotus, emanated from Egypt, there is an obvious antipathy; but it is easily solved, on the theory that the former was the popular, the latter the philosophical idea; two elements opposed to each other in almost every form of Paganism. And who can wonder at the anomalies they engender? Who can wonder if the belief of the ancients on the future fate of the soul fluctuates with an almost Protean versatility, when, as an eminent author remarks, the licence of Christian theory, within the sphere of a definite revelation, has variously conceived the doctrine of the Millennium, that of Purgatory under its various developments, and in recent times conflicting theories on the eternity of future suffering, and the final extinction or the final restitution of the wicked? But the papyrus rolls, which are often discovered enclosed in the sarcophagi, prove that the Egyptian creed included the belief in retribution after death. They shadow forth the awful form of the infernal judgment in the realms of Amenthe, wherein the deceased addresses the forty-two arbiters of eternity; the Goddess of Truth holds in her hands the record of his life; and, if good deeds prevail therein, he rests for evermore amid scenes of Osirian bliss.

The relation of the Etruscan creed to that of the Nile is one of partial analogy and partial discrepancy. There are no traces of any struggle between the popular and the philosophical doctrine, nor any evidence of a belief in the transmigration of the soul; while the sepulchral usages evince a more elegant and refined superstition than that which dictated the embalmment of the dead. On the other hand, it is clear that Etruscan imagination never soared to the spiritual idea of immortality; the decorations and furniture of the tombs speak a belief in the sensuous essence of the soul, which even in the grave is entranced by the scenes and pleasures of life. Emotions of surprise cannot but arrest the traveller on entering the Tarquinian tombs, at an exhibition so uncongenial to his own sombre conception of death:—

‘Can these scenes of feasting, of merriment,’ asks Mr. Dennis, ‘this dancing, this piping, this sporting, appertain to a tomb? There, on the

inner wall, and occupying the principal row, is a banquetting scene—figures in richly brodered garments recline on couches, feasting to the sound of lyre and pipes; attendants stand around, some replenishing the cups from the wine-jars on a side-board hard by; a train of dancers, male and female, beat time with lively steps to the notes of the instruments, on which some of them are performing; while in the lower row are depicted field sports, a boar hunt being the most conspicuous. But observe that fond and youthful pair on the central couch. The female, of exquisite beauty, turns her back upon the feast, and throws her arms passionately round the neck of her lover, who reclines behind her. The other guests quaff their wine without heeding them. The elegant forms of the couches and stools, the rich drapery, the embroidered cushions, show this to be a scene of high life, and give us some idea of Etruscan luxury.—Vol. i. p. 282.

The startling scene presented by Campanari's garden is thus described:—

'You seem transported to some scene of Arabian romance, where the people are all turned to stone, or lie spell-bound, awaiting the touch of a magician's wand to restore them to life and activity. All round the garden, under the close-embowering shade of trellised vines, beneath the drooping boughs of the willow, the rosy bloom of the oleander, or the golden fruit of the orange and citron, forming, in fact, the borders of the flower-beds—there they lie—Lucumones of aristocratic dignity—portly matrons, bedecked with jewels—stout youths and graceful maidens—reclining on the lids of their coffins, or rather on their festal couches—meeting with fixed, stony stare, the astonishment of the stranger, yet with a distinct individuality of feature and expression, and so lifelike that each seems to be on the point of warming into existence.'—Vol. i. p. 443.

'Like the figures on arras that gloomily glare,
As seen by the dying lamp's fitful light,
Lifeless, but lifelike, and awful to sight,
They seem through the dimness about to come down
From the shadowy wall where their images frown.'

The ascendancy which the doctrine of future retribution held over the Etruscan mind is clearly delineated by the sepulchral paintings, several of which are probably familiar to many of our readers in the illustrations of Mrs. Hamilton Gray, who copied them from the more correct and classical sketches of Micali. In consonance with the national belief which assigned to every man a good and an evil genius at his birth, the one commissioned to incite him to deeds of virtue, the other to deeds of evil, we find them portrayed in various scenes and functions, now drawing a car, upon which sits a soul shrouded with a veil, to the scene of the infernal judgment, now threatening with a heavy hammer wretched souls who are imploring mercy on their knees, now mounting guard upon the dark threshold of eternity, and pointing out the entrance with uplifted finger to some approaching spirit. Their distinctive attributes are discernible at a glance; all alike are winged, but the good are painted red or flesh-coloured, the ministers of darkness are black; the guardian

angels generally bear a wand; the malignant demon is armed with a hammer, sword, snakes, or a torch; the spirit who decrees the final judgment has a scroll, with writing implements, and sometimes a hammer and a nail, familiar to the readers of Horace as the emblems of an irrevocable doom. In the doctrine of dualism thus portrayed, and in the whole system of Etruscan demonology, Gerhard and Micali alike acknowledge the undeniable impress of the Oriental type. In Homer these subordinate divinities are scarcely recognised; in Hesiod they are uniformly good. Plutarch traces the belief in malignant demons to Egypt and Asia Minor; and it first appears in those philosophers of Greece who we know drank deeply from Oriental sources—Xenocrates, Empedocles, and Plato—in whose writings they are described as satanic and divine, and as characterised by all the intermediate shades of good and evil.

We thus find not only the conviction of the soul's eternity, and the connexion of its future happiness or misery with its career in life, but a belief in the essence of moral good and evil and the personality of spiritual agents, whose antagonism constitutes the moral contrasts of humanity, embodied in the Etruscan creed, and powerfully influencing the Etruscan imagination in all the developments and creations of art. But there are other elements of the national religion which at once distinguish it from the Hellenic faith, and connect it with an Eastern source. In their frequent ceremonial observances of expiation and lustration, they realized that idea of a special taint in crime, and of the necessity as well as sufficiency of religious ordinances for its removal, which Grote shows to have been utterly foreign to Homer's conceptions, and which Herodotus attributes to the Lydians in terms which corroborate the strong presumption of their intimate connexion by conquest or colonisation with Etruria. To Etruria Rome applied in a season of distress, Athens to the Cretan Epimenides, to conciliate an offended Providence by new orgies and rites of absolution; and the principal Hellenic mysteries and forms of expiation were confessedly of exotic, if not all of Asiatic origin; while those permanent establishments of hereditary families of priests, which arose from the exigencies under which foreign rites had been invoked, were equally at variance with the native tone of the Grecian mind (though the spontaneous growth of Egypt and Etruria) as the whole Oriental element of religious melancholy and penance, which would have been held a desecration of the primitive Hellenic festival, emphatically the season of cheerful harmony and social enjoyment. Eastern superstitions mingled with Grecian faith as the Titaresius, in the legend, mingled with the Peneus, without interfusing its waves: they

harmonised with the genius of Etruria as the confluence of sister streams. The religion of Hellas was the voluntary adoption of her children, stamped with the impress of Hellenic sensibility and imagination; lively, joyous, and elastic; inspiring, but not controlling, art and literature; independent of political systems, and equally susceptible of implicit faith and allegorical development: the Etruscan creed was imposed upon a subject people by the ascendancy of a priestly caste, whose ritual influenced, but was not an emanation of, the national character: it was veiled in an impenetrable shroud of mystic and symbolical imagery: intolerant of every rival, it absorbed freedom, alike in all its germs and creations, whether intellectual, political, or artistic: it arrayed itself, like the Roman Catholic, in the robes of illusion, and was armed with all the prestige of ceremonial pomps and observances: it was an all-pervading principle, the leaven of society, the very atmosphere of existence.

The mystical features of the Etruscan system deserve illustration, not only because they have been exaggerated and distorted, but because they are prominent among the types of Orientalism. Among the more ordinary symbols are the Hippocampi and watersnakes, usually regarded as emblematic of the soul's passage from life to the shades of eternity—an interpretation sustained at once by the shrouded spirits and figures of boys riding on their backs, and by their amphibious character, evidently the type of a double state of existence. Dolphins, painted alternately red and black, figure among the sepulchral ornaments, and probably symbolise the maritime sceptre of Etruria; while the rolling border beneath them represents the waves, in which they are tossing and careering, as in the Virgilian picture of the shield of Æneas. But, of all Etruscan emblems, serpents are perhaps the most pregnant with a varied mystical significance. Now they are the types of health and renovation, of Apollo and Esculapius; now, the symbols of sanctity, distinguishing generally the sacred from the profane; now, the emblems of volcanic agencies and Typhonian powers; now, the instruments of terror, brandished in the hands of priests at the head of advancing hosts, and riveting the ascendancy of the sacerdotal order by passively yielding to the potent fascination of soothsayers and charmers—not, however, that the veneration of the reptile was peculiar to Etruria or even to the East. But in the Etruscan symbolism of the soul, or spiritual essence, under the figure of a bird, we trace a very curious affinity to the Scriptural system of types. It is well known that the series of emblems so profusely employed by the Fathers in the exposition of Holy Writ, was handed down from

age to age by the traditions of 'the Schools of the Prophets;' and S. Augustine applies this instrument of interpretation to a difficulty in the Old Testament, doubtless with authority from ancient usage. In his version, the passage in Genesis xv., which describes Abraham, in offering a sacrifice of a heifer, a goat, a ram, a turtle-dove and a young pigeon, as leaving the birds alone undivided with his knife, is connected with a parallel in 1 Cor. iii., where S. Paul asserts that those who have built upon the foundation of Christ works of gold, silver, and precious stones, will not only be saved, but receive a reward; while those who have built upon the same foundation works of hay and stubble, shall themselves be saved, 'yet so as by fire,' while their works shall be consumed. The birds, he says, are emblematic of the first of the two classes mentioned by S. Paul; and, accordingly, Abraham does not divide *them*, because they represent the truly spiritual, between whom and their works there is no *division*.

Among other authentic emblems of Etruscan superstition are the hammer, the symbol of supernatural, generally of fiendish, power; the twisted wand, the attribute of benign divinity; the snake-bound brow, the herald of sovereignty; the fish, typifying ocean's depths; the rudder and the trident, the attributes of maritime supremacy; wings, distinguishing the spiritual from the human; and griffons, marking evil and destructive agencies.¹

The deathbed scenes, favourite subjects in many of the tombs, often exhibit exquisite tenderness and pathos, and prove that the sombre religion of the country did not repress, even if it failed to stimulate, affectionate sensibility. In one of the sepulchral paintings of Volterra, 'a female is stretched upon her couch: her father, husband, sisters or daughters, are weeping around her: her little ones stand at her bedside, unconscious

¹ The following extract will show how loose a rein Professor Orioli, a distinguished member of the modern school of Italian antiquaries, has given to his fancy in mystic interpretation:—'The Grotta de Pompeio at Tarquinii,' says he, 'manifestly figures the kingdom of Shades and the infernal world. The pillar in the centre is the chief of the five mountains which were supposed to support our globe. The surrounding frieze expresses this still better in the language of art; for its upper portion, with its waves and dolphins, indicates most clearly the sea which covers the infernal world and surrounds our globe; and the lower, with rose flowers, indicates the infernal world itself, which has its peculiar vegetation. The pillar itself, still better to set forth the hidden idea of the artist, bears the rose flowers, but no waves or dolphins, because the central mountain which it represents has vegetation, but is not covered by the sea. Nor are the mutules and triglyphs without meaning; for as in architecture they represent beams and rafters, so here they are hieroglyphical of the skeleton and framework of the infernal world and of its great mountain, which of rocks makes beams, but not less bold than that other, which of the waves of the sea makes a meander pattern.'—*Ann. Inst.* 1884, pp. 156-159.

'how soon they are to be bereft of a mother's tenderness—a moment near at hand, as is intimated by the presence of a winged genius with a torch on the point of expiring. Again, on an urn, on the lid of which he reclines in effigy, a youth is represented on horseback about to start on that journey from which no traveller returns, when his little sister rushes in, and strives to stay his horse's steps—in vain, for the relentless messenger of Death seizes the bridle and hurries him away. Here, again, the man is already mounted, driven away by Charon with his hammer; while a female genius affectionately throws her arm round the neck of the disconsolate widow, and tries to assuage her grief.'—Vol. ii. p. 193.

But, perhaps, the most honourable trait of Etruscan character, distinguished alike from Grecian and Oriental customs, is the national homage to the fair sex. The assertion of Nepos, that no Roman was ashamed to be seen with his lady by his side at table, is eminently true of Etruria, in whose sepulchral devices husband and wife are constantly seen reclining together in family and festal scenes. Indeed, it is highly probable that the Roman veneration for woman, which so prominently figures in the annals of the Eternal City—in the legend of Virginia, the chaste revenge of Lucretia, the heroism of Clælia—exhibiting the Roman matron as the

——— 'Clarum ac venerabile nomen,
'Gentibus, ac nostræ multum quod profuit urbi'—

was at least fostered by Etruscan influence. The Athenians considered the graces of art and literature thrown away upon their consorts, and reserved all feminine accomplishments to enhance the fascinations of their mistresses: whereas the Etruscan ladies received a refined education, and were sometimes initiated into the mysteries of divination; and the same courtesy and homage which attended them on earth followed them to the grave. Their sepulchral decorations and furniture are more sumptuous and elaborate than their lords—a distinction which they well deserved, if we may judge of the elegance and modesty of their lives from the surviving scenes in which they are portrayed, and from the emblems in their hands, which are usually a pomegranate as the symbol of fertility, and a tablet or scroll, the type of education. The tyrant sex, on the other hand, are reclining in luxurious indolence, their brows wreathed with festive chaplets—a wine-jug in one hand and a goblet in the other. We have no desire to enlist in an indiscriminate defence of Etruscan manners against the charge of indelicacy; but such an accusation comes with peculiar ill grace from Greece, and we have every reason to believe that infringements of social decency were monopolised by the male sex.

Timæus might have glanced at home at the licensed nudity of Spartan and Thessalian girls, before he charged the Etruscan banqueters with being waited upon by naked handmaids. No countenance to the calumny has been elicited from any Etruscan monument, painting or relief, yet discovered: on the contrary, all surviving relics exhibit feminine forms draped in a style which might well have caused Grecian modesty to blush; and Niebuhr agrees with modern Italian writers in a summary rejection of the libels retailed by Theopompus—that inveterate scandal-monger of antiquity!—of the shameless profligacy of Etruscan morals.

Adepts in luxury, and lovers of sumptuous life, for which the richly diversified produce of Tuscany, and their widely extended commerce, gave them ample opportunities, they were far superior to the Greeks in mere material civilization. The Etruscan cities presented a remarkable contrast to those of Hellas, in the health and cleanliness which resulted from their skill in sewerage, which has left its vestiges on many an Etruscan site, and reared an undying memorial in the Cloaca Maxima of Rome. The art of drainage, in its relation to agriculture, they practised with admirable skill. On the banks of the Po, in the neighbourhood of Hadria, they carried out those operations, whereby, in modern days, the Chiana has been converted from a barren pestilential swamp into a richly cultivated plain. The river, confined within dams, was continually raising its bed, which would have rendered it necessary to heighten the dyke, and have tasked the energies of man in an unequal struggle with the powers of nature, had not the Tuscans usefully employed the superfluous waters, by diverting them into the marshes, only to withdraw them when the fertilising deposit had once been secreted. The region alluded to would be thankful for such an operation now; and Etruscan skill would have saved Florence from the terrific inundations of the middle ages. Another method which enabled them to redeem land for the purposes of agriculture, was that of tunnelling the hills in which Tuscany abounds, and thus letting off the lakes which had formed in the craters of extinct volcanoes. These tunnels, says Niebuhr, are still at work among the mountains, though unknown to the ignorant peasantry, whose tarns they drain. This extraordinary people combined in a remarkable degree the two great elements of material prosperity, agriculture and trade; their skill in husbandry needs no other eulogy than Virgil's line—

—— Sic fortis Etruria crevit——

which extols it as the vital source of the splendour and the strength of Etruria.

In commerce they rivalled Tyrian enterprise, studding with their colonies the waters of the Tyrrhene Sea, and the shores of Spain, and competing even with Carthage for the 'far isle of the Blest.'¹ Their knowledge of physic is celebrated by Æschylus.² In the art of war Rome condescended to borrow from Etruria, and their astronomical science enabled them to approach more nearly than any nation of antiquity to the true division of time, when they fixed the tropical year at exactly 365 days, five hours and forty minutes. But, with all this, Tuscan civilization was the civilization of the mass; not, like the glorious culture of Greece, that which elicits and fosters the brightest sparks of personal energy and genius: it stereotyped, instead of inspiring society: it could never have been prolific of the noble literary fruits of Hellenic and Roman freedom—the impassioned eloquence of Demosthenes and Æschines, the splendid harmony of Cicero, the 'pictured page' of Livy, the deep meditations of Plato, the dignity and pathos of the Greek Tragedians; it could never have fought a Marathon, nor developed an intense national unity, nor achieved the imperial idea of widespread conquest and dominion. Doubtless, the peculiar influence of the government contributed largely to imbue the national civilization with its sombre hues and rigid lines. That government was an aristocracy; but it was a close, not an open aristocracy, resembling the oligarchy of mediæval Venice, and unlike the happily tempered constitution of old Rome and our own England, which continually derives fresh pith and vigour by keeping the avenues of honour open to plebeian merit. It possessed indeed many of the inherent virtues of aristocracy—the permanence and stability it gives to government, the check upon licentious excesses which long habituation to power maintains over the ruling class; and that prevision for the future, which is natural to the holders of an hereditary stake in the land: but it was eminently defective in the cardinal virtue of antagonism; it lacked the main-spring of political energy which the democratic element embodies. But this was not all, for the spiritual and temporal functions united in the same ruler. The Chief Pontiff was the Chief Magistrate, and the terrors of superstition supported the decrees of the Prince. 'Before the gate of that Paradise,' says Mr. Dennis, 'where the intellect revels unfettered amid speculations on its own nature, on its origin, existence, and final destiny, on its relation to the First Cause, to other minds, and to society in general—stood the Sacerdotal Lucumo, brandishing in one hand the

¹ Probably Madeira, or one of the Canaries.

² Apud Theophr. H. P. ix. 15.

'double-edged sword of secular and ecclesiastical authority, and holding in the other the books of Tages, exclaiming to his awe-struck subjects, "Believe and Obey!" Liberty of thought and action were as incompatible with the assumption of infallibility in the governing power in the days of Tarchon and Porsena, as in those of Gregory XVI.'—*Introd.* p. i.

It is impossible to ascertain accurately the rights and position of the lower classes in Etruria. The constitution of society was probably feudal; but the commonalty were evidently not in a degraded state of serfdom, since they composed the flower of the national army, and the military profession was always a privilege in ancient times. Considering the uncertainty of the topic, it is amusing to see with what peremptory assurance two of the ablest writers on Etruria deduce the condition of the people from the character of the public works. 'It was because the Etruscan State,' says Niebuhr, 'was founded upon conquest' (an assumption!) 'that the nobles had such a multitude of clients, like the Thessalian penestæ, whom they employed in task-work, and without whom their colossal works could hardly have been achieved. The works of the Etruscans, the very ruins of which astonish us, cannot, it is perfectly evident, have been executed in small states without task-masters and bondsmen.' (Vol. i. p. 117.) Micali, on the other hand, as confidently tells us that the wonderful remains extant 'do not bear the impress of servile labour—as little do they of the entire subjection and enslavement of the people; *they are rather the works of well-ordered citizens*, which to him who actually inspects them have nothing to surpass in manual labour the powers of free and by no means large communities; more particularly, since the materials were found on the very spot, or on the neighbouring mountains, which are extremely abundant in stone for masonry.'—*Storia di Ital.* Vol. i. p. 135.

But we are sorry to see the high authority of Niebuhr employed to endorse the common fallacy, which exaggerates the influence of political constitution upon art. A brief review of the phenomena will show that, with the exception of those fantastic exertions of despotic caprice which reared the stupendous piles of Egypt and Assyria, (and the great historian confesses that Etruscan works were uniformly dedicated to *useful* purposes,) the different forms of government, and of national religion, and also the influence of climate and scenery, are at best conditions, not causes of the prosperity of art. It is observable that the useful arts flourish indiscriminately beneath the monarchical sceptre, and the republican flag, wherever the popular taste is eminently practical. Regal and Imperial Rome reared some of the proudest structures the

world has seen; but many of the noblest temples, aqueducts, roads and amphitheatres, were wrought under consular auspices. Throughout her most brilliant æra, Rome enjoyed a constitution in many points similar to that of Athens; but at Rome architecture—to use a single illustration—assumed, in consonance with the national bias, the useful or constructive, at Athens the ornamental form. In modern times English and American freedom has developed with intense energy the useful and mechanical sciences. But the Fine Arts are still more independent of varieties of political constitution. They require, indeed, as one of their conditions, freedom: and that they cease to bloom beneath a spiritual despotism, is clear from the invariable degeneracy of Hieratic art. But it matters not whether that freedom be the meridian splendour of an Athens under the rule of a Pericles, or the turbulent energy of faction, which, to use Dante's expressive image, tossed mediæval Florence as convulsions toss the fevered patient: or whether the sparks of genius be fostered by the wise and beneficent sceptre of an Augustus, a Leo X., or a Louis XIV. But favourable conditions may exist in abundance without a School of Art. The fires of genius rise in fitful gleams, resembling the spontaneous and irregular energy of volcanic flames, and are usually kindled by some mighty outburst of irrepressible feeling, which thrills throughout the world, religious, political, and artistic. Thus Ariosto and Tasso, two out of the five epic poets who have appeared in 3,000 years, were the offspring of a single century; and in the wonderful age that witnessed the Reformation, 'three mighty spirits,' says Mrs. Jamieson,¹ 'were stirring society to its depths—the spirit of bold investigation into truths of all kinds, which led to the Reformation; the spirit of daring adventure, which led men in search of new worlds beyond the eastern and the western oceans; and the spirit of art, through which men soared even to the seventh heaven of invention.' But the main requisite is that civilization should be individual, not collective: that it should not tend, like our own, in the opinion of the sternest of political economists, 'to render the power of persons acting in masses the only substantial power in society, but to maintain that originality of mind and individuality of character which are the only source of any real progress, and of most of the qualities which make the human race superior to any herd of animals.' We have been led into these remarks by a desire to protest against that debasing philosophy, so prevalent among modern writers on the

¹ Memoirs of the Early Italian Painters, vol. ii. p. 6.

² Mill's Pol. Econ. vol. ii. p. 530, third edition.

early history of society, which is apt to regard man as almost the passive instrument of outward influences, and to assign very undue weight to mere physical accidents in the development of art and science, and the formation of national character: thus ignoring the providential design which has chequered the attributes of races with such prodigal variety, and has so richly diversified the faculties and the destiny of the same people in the different stages of its career.

No fresh light having been recently thrown upon the Etruscan language—the only satisfactory key to the origin of the people—we will not plunge our readers into a disquisition on that insoluble enigma, the origin of the Etruscan race. Suffice it to say that, in the absence of any decisive historical evidence, the indigenous theory has been warmly espoused by Micali; the Rhætian by K. O. Müller and Niebuhr; the Celtic by the Quixotic caprice of Sir William Betham; the Egyptian by Mrs. H. Gray, and the Lydian, apparently on far better grounds, by Mr. Dennis. It cannot, however, be out of place to offer a few remarks on the characteristics and originality of Etruscan art, though we are unable to afford space to treat this branch of the subject with the detail it deserves.

And, first, we may well congratulate criticism on the blow which the Egyptian mania has received from recent investigation. It is astonishing through how many ages not only the popular traveller, but the learned historian have been haunted by the hoary imposture of the sages of the Nile, whose pride was so deeply interested in spreading the delusion that their own shores gave birth to the noble civilization of Greece. How amusing is the style in which Herodotus, after lending a willing ear to the sacerdotal myths, and stating his conviction of the Coptic origin of Hellenic culture, unconsciously refutes his own story by displaying in elaborate detail the marked contrast of Greek and Egyptian religion, manners, and social institutions! To Mr. Sharpe,¹ we believe, belongs the credit of first suggesting the source of this misapprehension. That author shows that there had been from the earliest times an important settlement of Greek traders at Naucratis and Sais in the Delta; who had always carried on a chief part of the Mediterranean traffic.

The overthrow of this little community in the reign of Amumnai Amemneb dispersed the Hellenic merchants, and the return of the refugees to their native shores was subsequently developed into a direct colonization by the people of the Nile. But in the very age when the fabulous colonies of Danaus and

¹ History of Egypt, London, 1846.

Cecrops are presumed to have left Egypt, that country was not only intensely prejudiced against all foreigners, but especially abhorred sailors, and held maritime voyages as impious. Colonel Mure observes, that the ready adoption of the Coptic fictions by the Greeks is easily explained by the characteristic zeal of the race to establish analogies between its religious rites and those of surrounding nations, each of whom had its own polytheistic system, in which they soon discovered a new variety of their own Jupiter, Apollo, or Minerva. When the question arose as to the prototype of any divinity, the award of preference was naturally assigned to Egypt, from her superior claims to antiquity of social culture. The ministers of Isis were not slow to flatter the national vanity by interweaving with the native Greek traditions divers romantic adventures respecting Io of Argos, Perseus and Helen, thoroughly foreign to the genuine principles of Egyptian mythology. The utter futility of the attempts so perseveringly made by the Ptolemies to reconcile the conflicting creeds, conclusively betrays their essential discrepancy. But there are not only historical, but the strongest philological objections to the Egyptian legend. Colonel Mure is surely entitled to his canon, that no extensive social influence can be exercised by a civilized on a comparatively barbarous people, without a corresponding influence upon its language. Now the Greek and Egyptian languages are radically distinct in character and structure: nor are there any traces of that secondary correspondence between the two vocabularies which represents social intercourse.

Those of our readers who are aware how long the ghost of this exploded fanaticism has hovered around the regions of Etruscan research, will not deny the relevancy of the foregoing remarks. Antiquaries have never been wanting who have rashly inferred the Egyptian origin of the Etruscan race and of Etruscan art, merely from the mutual presence of certain affinities common to the infancy of all art. And this in spite of national peculiarities in Etruscan relics, such as *winged* sphinxes, alien from the Coptic style: not to mention the obvious probability that the extensive commerce of Etruria enabled her to import every variety of foreign manufacture.¹ These sages

¹ Such was probably the history of the Etruscan gems or *scarabæi*, which have been far too hastily enlisted in support of the Egyptian theory. Whether they were worn as mere ornaments, or amulets as in Egypt, they are broadly distinguished from the Egyptian, both in material, form and decoration; the subjects not being hieroglyphics, as in the land of the Nile, but, generally, groups chosen from the Greek mythology, varied by chimæras and other symbols of the Etruscan creed. They have also been discovered in Ægina, Attica and Acarnania; which must therefore fairly compete with Egypt for the honour of the invention, if we are determined to deny it to Etruria.

may, perhaps, condescend to learn common sense from Mr. Dennis's admonition, that baby faces are very similar all the world round.

Of all the elaborate creations of Etruscan art, the works in bronze have probably the best title to originality. Their metallic statues not only filled the temples and luxurious palaces of Rome, but even in the age of Pericles, the Athenian poet Pherecrates sang of the Etruscan candelabra: and Phidias gave to his celebrated statue of Minerva sandals of the Etruscan mode. Even Athenians might well be proud of such exquisite gems as the bronze lamp in the Museum at Cortona, the casket from Vulci, the golden wreaths in the Museo Gregoriano, and the beautiful filagree-work in gold, which it would task the best efforts of Hindoo art to rival. But the chief argument in favour of their native origin is the fact, that Greek inscriptions never appear upon the bronzes, whereas they are almost invariably found on the best and largest class of the painted vases, whose Hellenic extraction is now almost an article of faith among the leading antiquaries, though it has not found equal acceptance with popular prejudice in our own country. The ordinary classification of these vases, (which embodies truth as well as error, and ought not, therefore, to be rudely thrust aside, until we have surer ground,) distinguishes three styles; the Oriental, the Etruscan, and the Greek. The title of the first is justified by the Oriental deities and chimæras, the rudeness of the design, and the prevalence of figures of wild beasts, usually lions and boars, glaring at each other: sphinxes and griffons, blended with quaint foliage and flowers, especially the lotus. The epithet Etruscan is very inappropriate to the second class, for which Archaic Greek would be a fitter designation, since it is found in great quantities in Campania and Sicily, and the subjects and inscriptions are uniformly Hellenic. It is recognised by the black figures, always a characteristic of archaicism, on a yellow ground: by a stiff, severe and thoroughly conventional design, in which the attitudes are constrained, the muscles amusingly exaggerated, and the hands and feet preposterously long, like those of an ourang-outang. The justice of the title bestowed upon the third class will hardly be disputed: it is characterised by a black ground, and is pre-eminent in elegance of form, brilliancy of varnish, and exquisite beauty of design. The devices vary from those of the preceding class only in the fact that the myths and the scenes from social and domestic life are Athenian rather than Greek, and belong, says Gerhard, to the period between 484 B.C. and 284, when the Greek colonies were in the full bloom of prosperity. Antiquaries are much divided in opinion as to their mother country;

some maintaining them to be all imported from Greece and her colonies; others asserting their native Etruscan origin; while another school attempts to reconcile conflicting facts by 'imagining an extensive population of Greeks settled for ages 'in Etruria, or at least bodies of Hellenic artists, like the 'masonic corporations of the middle ages.' (*Introd.* p. 87.) If, amid such a host of authorities, we may presume to offer an opinion, we would suggest that they were originally of Grecian manufacture, adopted as models for Etruscan imitation, with occasional variations of style; a supposition which would explain the local peculiarities which the pottery betrays on the various sites. If Etruscan bronzes found, as we have seen, a ready market in Greece, why should not Athenian vases have been equally acceptable among the luxurious Etruscans? It is notorious that an extensive commerce in such articles prevailed in ancient times;¹ and the pottery of Athens, we know, was carried by the Phœnician traders to the western coast of Africa, and bartered for elephants' teeth and leopards' skins.² The speculæ, or bronze mirrors, which the Italians usually designate 'mystic,' though Gerhard has shown solid grounds for believing that they served no other mysteries than those of the toilet, have certainly far higher pretensions to Etruscan invention than the vases. For the most numerous class, although decorated with scenes taken from the cycle of Greek mythology, or heroic legend, are always illustrated by Etruscan inscriptions, and often nationalized by the introduction of Etruscan demons. And another style, though not so common, is ornamented, says Mr. Dennis, with the symbols of the divinities of the national creed, from the Nine great Gods who wielded the thunder, through all the grades of their wild and multiform demonology, to the lowly Penates, the protectors of the domestic hearth. The inscriptions on these mirrors shed so valuable a light upon the national manners and religion, that Chevalier Bunsen terms them 'a Figurative Dictionary of Etruscan Mythology,' and they will probably be the basis of all that may ultimately be known of the Etruscan tongue.

From this brief review of the main features of Etruscan civilization, the reader will, perhaps, be able to judge how exaggerated is Mr. Dennis's estimate of the influence of Etruria upon Rome. That influence, indeed, was deep and lasting; but it was so, because, in mingling with the Roman character, it mingled with an element essentially nobler than itself. To Etruria Rome owed those emblems of petty rule which her own energies converted into the symbols of an earth-encircling

¹ Pliny, lib. xxxv. cap. 46.² Grote, *History of Greece*, vol. iii. p. 364.

dominion. To Etruria she owed that stern theocratic discipline which so deeply coloured, though it did not originally inspire, her greatest national virtue—the devoted patriotism of her children. From Etruria Rome derived that idea of the omnipresence of the Divinity, and that love of ceremonial ordinance, which contributed so powerfully to rivet the traditional creed upon the popular mind. But the Roman character was built upon too wide and varied a foundation to allow of the tyranny of any single principle in its constitution. Unlike the partial and one-sided type which distinguished the Grecian communities, the qualities of three races mingled in its formation; the nobler and simpler worship of his Sabine and Latin ancestors saved the Roman from the dogmatic formalism which enchained the people of Tarquini; from the caste-like distinction of priests and people, and the formal civilization of Etruria; and above all, from the rapid degeneracy of religion into superstition, and then of fanaticism into hypocrisy, which had sapped Etruscan morals before the era of the Roman conquest. Where shall we find the Etruscan original of those admirable maxims, which Tully quotes with honest pride in his treatise on the laws? which bade the Roman propitiate¹ the Deity, not with sumptuous offerings, but with the incense of a virtuous life; which prohibited all unholy² and licentious objects of adoration; which taught the indwelling³ of the Divinity in the minds of the good; and, for ages, sacredly maintained the principle of an hereditary national religion, both against the waywardness of private dissent,⁴ and the torrent of Greek and Oriental corruptions? Where are we to recognise the Etruscan rivals of that long triumphal train of senators, warriors, and patriots, the glory of the Roman name, the grandest fruit of any heathen system—of that splendid literary array, that disputes the palm with Hellas—of that immortal legacy of jurisprudence, which has been the admiration and despair of posterity?

Let us not, however, forget the beautiful lesson taught by the Etruscan tombs—the lesson of veneration for the dead! Let us mourn over the glorious wrecks so thickly strewn upon the bosom of that exquisite land, once studded with fair and blooming cities; where now the moss-grown heights she once crowned scarce bear a vestige of Tarquini; while ‘the very

¹ Cicero de Legg. ii. viii. Ad Divos adeunto caste: *pietatem adhibento: opes amovento.*

² Ib. ib. Nulla Vitiorum sacra solennia obeunto.

³ Ib. xi. Deos ipsos in animis suis collocatos putent.

⁴ Ib. viii. Separatim nemo habessit Deos: neve novos, nisi publice adsecutos, colunto. Foreign Deities could only be admitted within the Roman Pantheon by a decree of the Senate.

'site of Volsinii is forgotten; silence has long reigned in the
'crumbling theatre of Ferentum; the plough yearly furrows
'the bosom of Vulci; and the fox, the owl, and the bat, are the
'sole tenants of the vaults within the ruined walls of Cosa.'
(Vol. ii. p. 193.) Let us not forget, too, how the loveliness of
Nature has survived the decay of art, the fall of empire. The
snow-white pinnacles and towers, the fairy scene that greeted
the eye of the voyager Rutilius, as he turned his prow towards
the far-famed harbour of Luna, have long been numbered with
the things of yore. Not so the gifts of Nature to that glorious
bay! Still the purest of waves mirrors 'pine-crested convents
'—luxuriant groves—storm-defying forts—castled crags—
'proud headlands—foam-fretted islets—dark heights, prodigal
'of wine and oil—purple mountains behind—and naked marble-
'peaked Apennines over all, (vol. ii. p. 80,)

“Islanded in immeasurable air.”

Still the green Maremma (unhealthy only in the summer)
expands its 'sunbright waste of beauty'—its 'lawns and
wasteness wild,' that inspired Dante's imagination with his
picture of the Infernal Wood—matted with a dense and almost
tropical luxuriance, where the boar, the buffalo, the roebuck
range unscared by the foot of man. And what shall eclipse the
scenery on the verge of the Faliscan plain, where 'the cliffs,
'broken into fantastic forms, and hollowed into caves of myste-
'rious interest, display the richest hues of brown, red, orange
'and grey; wood hangs from their every ledge, and even crests
'their brows—a wood as varied in mass as in tint—olive, ash,
'alder, oak, chestnut—matted together with ivy, vines, clematis
'and honey-suckle; a stream winds brawling through the hol-
'low, here spanned by a rustic bridge, there sinking in a mimic
'cascade; now struggling among the fallen, moss-grown crags,
'now running riot through some lonely mill, half hid by foliage.'
Vol. i. p. 154.

ART. IV. —“*The Kings of the East;*” an Exposition of the Prophecies; determining, from Scripture and from History, the Power for whom the Mystical Euphrates is being “dried up;” with an Explanation of certain other Prophecies concerning the Restoration of Israel. London. Seeleys. 1849.

AMONG the signs of that desire to penetrate the secrets of futurity which lies so deeply enshrined in the heart of man; whether Pagan or Christian, civilized or uncultivated, it is no marvel that investigation of the fortunes of God's ancient people should occupy a very marked and prominent position; for the conversion of the Jews to Christianity has long been looked for as the Church's last great labour of love—the sure token of the immediate return of her Lord to judgment. Among living divines, who have expressed their concurrence in such belief, it may suffice to name Archdeacon Grant and Canon Wordsworth; within the last three centuries it has been proclaimed by theologians of the most opposite communions, as, for instance, Estius and Vitringa; in the Middle Ages it appears to have been held by the latest of the fathers, S. Bernard, and by the greatest of the schoolmen, Aquinas; in earlier times it may be found associated with the very noblest names of saints and doctors—Gregory, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom. It may be indeed that S. Jerome wavers and is not quite consistent with himself; the ‘golden-mouthed’ Archbishop of Constantinople (herein followed by Aquinas and Cajetan) may proceed to the extreme length of asserting that *none* among the descendants of Abraham after the flesh shall in those last days remain in unbelief; while S. Gregory more reasonably supposes that a large and signal conversion would satisfy and adequately fulfil the promises of ancient prophecy. But these are minor points, diversities such as we must expect to meet with in any enunciations of belief upon subjects of large extent, and of necessity somewhat obscure and undefined—and so far are they from weakening the effect of the general agreement, that they may fairly be considered rather to increase its weight and influence.

There has been, however, by some writers (and more especially in the present day), combined with the expectation of a great Jewish conversion in the last times, a further hope, amounting in some cases to a positive conviction, that Israel and Judah will be collected from all quarters of the globe, and enjoy

territorial possession of their long-lost homes in Palestine. The supporters of this view appeal, for proof of its correctness, to the undying hopes and sentiments of the race of Israel, the language of certain among the primitive fathers, and the words of Holy Scripture itself.

We propose to devote some pages to the consideration of this two-fold subject. If any approximation to a thorough sifting of the evidence be not merely far beyond the limits of an article, but likewise greatly exceed the bounds of our knowledge and ability, it may yet be possible, (with the aid of learned men, who have indicated the best places for research,) to extract so much material as may supply a basis for argument, and a help towards the formation of an opinion, on the part of such as feel any interest in the inquiry.

And firstly, with reference to the belief in a large and a very general conversion from the ranks of Judaism before the consummation of all things. That belief, however vague and indefinite—however much infused into the general mind of Christendom rather by a floating kind of tradition, than as the result of strict inquiry—yet certainly seems to be originally based upon the sure warrant of Holy Scripture. The great men who have from time to time enunciated their views concerning it, invariably appeal to the words of Prophets and Apostles; and although we must beware of the error of erecting interpretations of prophecy into articles of faith, yet that must be a strange and unenviable frame of mind which can treat such a *consensus* lightly. A few of the most obvious and prominent passages of Scripture shall presently be set down, and the comments of the leading Fathers will be quoted in the course of our investigation. But it may be well to commence with a brief notice of the objections which have been urged against these interpretations of prophecy.

Some of these objections, which have been sought from Holy Scripture, savour less of conviction on the part of the objectors, than of that scholastic ingenuity which loved to create a difficulty for the sake of solving it. (1) Few unbiassed readers of the 69th Psalm would be inclined so to press the force of the word 'ever' in the 24th verse, ('and ever bow thou down their backs,' *'et dorsum eorum semper incurva,'* Vulg.) as to argue that it shut out the objects of the divine malediction from *all* hope of the erect countenance and clear vision of faith. (2) In like manner the marked distinction between Israel and Judah, in Hosea i. 6, 7, (fulfilled in the return of the *two* tribes and dispersion of the *ten*), can hardly be thought seriously to militate against the possibility of Jews from every tribe returning to their King before He comes to judgment. (3) The same may

be said concerning the words of the Prophet Amos (ii. 4—16): as a threat of chastisement they are clear, and have been, and are still being, most signally and terribly fulfilled; but to make them into an edict of perpetual exclusion from God's Church, appears sadly strained and unnatural. (4) And as regards the very strong expressions employed by S. Paul concerning his countrymen in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 15, 16), it may be observed, that even the rendering of the Vulgate, to the effect that 'wrath is come upon them even to the end,' *usque in finem*, is by no means incompatible with the supposition that their repentance should be almost coincident with the termination of the world's great drama; although most scholars and critics would, we think, consider the English version of the Apostle's *εἰς τέλος* ('to the uttermost') to be a far more adequate expression of his meaning. (5) There are, however, two sentences pronounced by our Lord himself, which have been thought adverse to any spiritual hopes of Judaism. One of these is a remarkable saying recorded by S. John (v. 43);¹ the other, the curse upon the barren fig-tree, which has always been recognised as a type and figure of the Synagogue. Now there is no doubt but that the ancient interpretation of our Lord's announcement, that one coming in his own name would be received, applied the words to the Antichrist who should appear in the last days. In this interpretation (which, by the way, seems accepted by Lord Bacon) we may concur, and further may likewise admit that it appears to hint that this 'last foe of the fold' will be welcomed and believed in by the Jews. Yet this acceptance need not prove so large as to involve the entire race of Israel, nor again so complete as to leave no opportunity for change of sentiment; while the type of the fig-tree, however fully admitted, must yet be subjected to the limitations imposed upon all types, and not be forced into an utter exactitude of resemblance. The literal fig-tree was indeed dried up from the roots, and withered away, but it does not thence follow that the figurative one shall know no second life.

And if we are disposed to weigh the authority of great human testimonies, the scantiness of the list of those who adopted what we may term the *negative* side, is most remarkable. Among ancient authors, there is probably one alone who has opposed the general concurrence of opinion—Cæsarius, the brother of S. Gregory Nazianzen. But his name, though a holy and respected one, cannot be reckoned in the first rank of the Church's doctors, and is not of sufficient weight to claim great

¹ 'I am come in My Father's name, and ye receive Me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.'

attention when it stands alone. It is more curious to light upon intimations that, in the sixteenth century, the theology of Switzerland inclined to the same view which had been put forward by Cæsarius. But this state of opinion did not last. Benedictus Aretius, a very eminent ecclesiastic of Berne, who died in A.D. 1574, gave in his adhesion to the general interpretation of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans—a circumstance noted by Estius in his commentary, with evident pleasure and satisfaction.¹ Had the life of Estius been prolonged, he might have found that Protestants were *more* than willing to agree with him in this respect. Vitringa even treats with some roughness those who ventured to dissent from a belief so apparently well founded. Of two distinguished men whom he thus condemns, viz. Hammond and Lightfoot, it may be observed that the former is not consistent with himself, for he follows the usual mode of understanding Romans xi.; while the latter reasons from abstract considerations, of no great force in themselves, and in a question of this nature absolutely valueless. For surely to say, as Lightfoot does, that the Jews of our Lord's time 'sinned against such light as shall *never* appear to their eyes again,'² is a pure assumption—an assumption, moreover, which, even if proved, would not meet the requirements of the case. Who, but One above, can judge whether any nation or any human being may deserve a fresh probation, or the contrary? If such were the common line of argument on that side, we can hardly wonder at Vitringa's language: 'Atqui *'dari et esse tantum bonum in promissis Ecclesiæ, quis inficias eat post clarissimam Apostoli doctrinam? Certè quicumque tentaverint hactenus, inter quos Lightfootus et Hammondus, infelicitè sunt executi.'*'³

We proceed to state the arguments (in our judgment much more forcible) in favour of eventual conversion. It may be that some particular passages of Holy Scripture which have been alleged upon this side will appear, to an impartial critic, as unavailing as those which have been already alluded to upon the negative view of the question. In patristic and medieval

¹ This circumstance is so little suspected, that it seems worth while to quote the passage. 'Quod adeo clarum apparet ex serie sermonis apostoli, ut *etiam* sectariorum quidam non infimi nominis theologus, Benedictus Aretius, evidentia hujus loci convictus, apertissime fateatur ac doceat in suo commentario generalem futuram Judæorum in fine mundi conversionem, ita ut major pars eorum tunc viventium agnitura sit Christum suum. Quam rem etiam subjunctâ ad Deum oratione prosequitur.'—Estius in D. Pauli Epist. (tom. i. p. 173.) Ed. Duaci, A.D. 1614. Our own quaint divine, Thomas Fuller, concludes his 'Pisgah-view of Palestine,' with a like prayer.

² Sermon at St. Mary's, Cambridge, Works, vol. ii. p. 1123, Ed. London, A.D. 1684. In another place (vol. i. p. 375), he speaks more guardedly upon the subject.

³ Vitringa in Jesaïam, cap. xi. v. 11, (tom. i. p. 442, Ed. Herbornæ, A.D. 1715.)

writings we find the Jewish nation regarded as the great collective Cain, who had shed 'the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel.' And even as the blood of Abel cried unto God from the ground, and he became 'a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth;' and as 'the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him;' so these, too, who had slain their brother, the true Abel, were to wander forlorn over the globe—marked, set aside, rejected 'from the presence of the Lord.' The language of the fifty-ninth Psalm was, as we shall see, continually applied to them.¹ But not in its threats alone: the words which, in our Bible version, say that 'they return at evening' (in the Vulgate, *convertentur ad vespem*) were ever borne in mind, and referred to as a ground of hope for that unhappy race before the coming of the final night. Now those who care little for types and analogies may pass by the similitude of Cain, and may argue, not without some show of reason, that the quotation from the Psalmist is violently severed from its context. But there is all imaginable difference between the use of figures and allusions to complete, to enforce, and to illustrate, and the employment of the same things as self-sufficing proofs and a primary basis of argument. And here the appeal lay first to those inspired declarations which look clear and evident. To cite two only out of a crowd of such testimonies: 'Afterward shall the children of Israel return 'and seek the Lord their God and David their king; and shall 'fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days.' 'I would 'not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest 'ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part 'is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come 'in. And so all Israel shall be saved.'² The opinions of commentators upon these and kindred promises we defer for the moment, and leave the sacred words to speak for themselves.

There are many to whom it would seem accordant with the analogy of the divine announcements respecting the future, that the spoken prophecy should be accompanied with an *acted* prophecy or type. If Cain, the first murderer; Canaan, accursed of his father; Hagar, cast out for her mocking; Miriam, shut out from the camp; be all as images of the unbelieving people,³ is there none among the saints of the elder covenant

¹ S. Aug. Enarr. in Psalm. lviii. (our lix.) Ibid. in Psalm. xl. (xli.) S. Bernard, Epist. 363. See, too, Mr. Trench's note on these words of a hymn by Adam of S. Victor (Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 146):—

Quia regem peremerunt,
Rei regnum perdiderunt:
Sed non deletur penitus
Cain, in signum positus.

² Hosea iii. 5. Romans xi. 25. ³ Vitringa on Isaiah l. 1, 2, (tom. ii. p. 704.)

upon whom we may cast our eyes as the pledge of better things to come? Yes, there is one such figure—a type, as it seems to us, of peculiar beauty and significance. There is a patriarch in whose career great writers of all ages—a Chrysostom, a Pearson, a Pascal—have delighted to trace the history of their Lord. Sold to the Midianites, slandered and condemned, though innocent; in prison between two offenders, of whom one is pardoned and one condemned; freed in the *third* year after *two* years of captivity; exalted to the right hand of Pharaoh, his wrongs the means of preserving life to others; in these and in other details men have long been brought to see the portraiture of the betrayed, the crucified, the risen and ascended Lord. It has not been, perhaps, so frequently observed, that it was *through the homage paid to Joseph by the heathen that his guilty brethren were brought to bow before him, and that he again made himself known to them.*¹ And shall not the ever-widening circle of pagan acknowledgment of Him whom his brethren after the flesh betrayed, bring *them* likewise in the fulness of time to kneel to him with prayer and praise; and the order of Simeon's prophetic words be literally preserved, 'the Lord's Christ' being first a 'light to lighten the Gentiles,' and then, in a fuller sense than ever, 'the glory of his people Israel?' The confident feeling of the fathers will be shown by the passages to be hereafter cited in connexion with the second branch of our inquiry. It is true, that no strength of conviction on this head would justify men in counting upon this event as a sure warning of the judgment-day; for (as a great theologian, Dean Jackson² reminds us) it might please the Almighty that such conversion should be sudden, and leave no interval for preparation on the part of those who witnessed it. But taking into account the *primâ facie* meaning of holy writ—the sanction given to such understanding of its meaning by the wise and good in all ages of the Church of Christ, the absence of weighty counter arguments or any names of high authority—it is no exaggeration to assert that there is not a point of belief concerning the future, without the boundaries of the Creeds, which has stronger claims upon the acceptance of a Christian man.

We now turn to the second portion of our subject—the *temporal* prospects of the Jewish race. There exists, as has been said, a school of interpretation which teaches that the Jews shall again become a nation, and enjoy the blessings of

¹ It is mentioned by Jones of Nayland, in his well-known little *Book of Nature*; and in the notes to a recent translation of Genesis by the Rev. J. Jervis. We do not know who first called attention to the point.

² Comment. on the Creed, (vol. i. p. 153, Ed. Lond. A. D. 1673.)

freedom and prosperity in the Holy Land. Whether their conversion to Christianity shall be contemporaneous with this event, or prior, or subsequent to it, is a point on which there may, naturally enough, be differences of opinion; but the prevalent view among the interpreters referred to we believe to be, that the restoration to Palestine will precede, and the conversion follow very speedily.

Now if these events, in their leading features at least, be written in the Word of God, it is enough, once and for all *cadit questio*. No abstract considerations, no apparent difficulties in the sight of man, can be accounted of the slightest weight in this; as in all things we ought to be 'fully persuaded that what He has promised He is able also to perform.' But if there be any room for doubt as regards the right understanding of His promises—and certainly religious and learned men *have* greatly doubted the correctness of this interpretation of them—it may then be perfectly lawful to enter upon any reverent course of reflection which may tend to throw light upon the probable meaning of these prophecies.

(a.) That there is no *necessary* connexion in the nature of things between the acceptance of Christianity and a particular habitation upon earth, will, of course, be universally admitted. We are not, as the Syrians of old, believers in gods of the hills and gods of the valleys: we do not seek, with the woman of Samaria, a mount Gerizim whereon to worship. The religion of the true Prophet knows no Mecca; His Gospel, though 'beginning at Jerusalem,' never summons the believers to the *local* Zion. On the contrary, it is the very glory of that society, which is built upon Him as its corner-stone, that it utterly repudiates such distinctions, that it is *essentially* universal, Catholic; that it strives to become 'all things to all men;' that 'there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.' But however fully these truths may be granted, we would fain ask whether they are thoroughly borne in remembrance and always duly weighed in their bearings upon the case before us? Do they harmonise best with a *literal* or with a *spiritual* fulfilment of the hopes held out to Judaism?

(b.) In close connexion with these ideas stands the received interpretation of the vision vouchsafed to Nebuchadnezzar. If the holy Daniel interpreted it, as most men think, to mean the four great empires of ancient heathendom, Assyria and Persia, Greece and Rome, and if the image representing them vanished away before 'the stone cut out without hands,' may not this be a hint, not, indeed, that the Almighty does not as ever rule in the kingdom of men, and give it to whomsoever He will; but

that we as Christians are to be less concerned with the fate and fall of kingdoms, since that great one has been set up which shall never be destroyed, but stand for ever? May not sympathy for that outcast race be in danger of recalling our thoughts from the spiritual to the earthly, from the manna to the fleshpots, if we insist on associating the idea of territorial possessions and national eminence to their hoped-for reception of those better blessings which are not for time, but for eternity?

(c.) Again, it is well known that this view of the promises is the one adopted by the Jews. '*Hanc opinionem origine Judæicam esse inter omnes constat,*' says a learned German of a kindred theory.¹ Can this circumstance be esteemed a recommendation? That people, so singularly infelicitous in divining the real meaning of the voices of their prophets, that they fulfilled them and perceived not what they did; that people, to whom the birth in Bethlehem and the slaughter of the innocents, the miracles, and the triumphal entry, the death with the malefactors, and the burial by Joseph, brought no thought of what had been foretold by Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Zachariah; that people, who have oftentimes accepted as the Christ the most wretched impostors, like Barchochebas, while 'when Moses is read the veil is upon their heart;' is it to *them* that we are to look for suggestions respecting the true sense of the seers of old? They pray indeed in all their services that they may regain the land of their forefathers, and such a prayer may well accord with the spirit of the elder covenant. For the righteous to be 'blessed in the city and blessed in the field,' was then a part of the dispensation of the Almighty; to die without passing the Jordan was a grievous chastisement to their great Law-giver. But are these blessings of like value in that newer kingdom, wherein the Cross precedes the Crown, alike for the Head and for the Members? Is the possession of the earthly Canaan, to a *Christian* eye, so very vast a prize, so worthy a fulfilment of the royal promises of Him who is the King of kings? Glorious, and full of poetry in its highest sense, as was the position of Moses on Mount Pisgah, yet must not its splendours grow dim and fade away before the marvels in which he shared on Mount Tabor? It was natural for him, while on earth, to mourn the loss of Canaan; could he, if it may be said with reverence, now desire it for the people whom he led?

(d.) Although we are taught that Israel is the *first-born* son of God,² yet it follows from this 'that other nations are also 'sons, and so the objects of His fatherly care; and therefore the

¹ Otto, note to S. Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. § 80, (tom. ii. p. 276.)

² Exodus iv. 22.

'disobedience of the first-born nation may lead to the installing others in its dignity. The pre-eminence of that tribe to which they belonged, only originated with the times immediately subsequent to the flood—a dispensation, therefore, which puts them upon a level with other nations, may not be any new thing under the sun, but that which hath been already.'¹ The sin of Reuben was, we may trust, forgiven; but neither he nor his descendants ever regained the patriarchal privileges of the eldest-born; but the three gifts were made separate and passed away—the royalty to Judah, the priesthood to Levi, the double portion to the sons of Joseph.²

(e.) There are certain prophecies of the most distinct and *apparently* literal character, to which, notwithstanding, it has not pleased their Author to vouchsafe a literal fulfilment. Such is, for example, the promise made to David that his throne should be established for ever;³ for, again, the pledge given to the tribe of Levi that their priesthood should be everlasting.⁴ As a plain matter of fact, no descendant of David now possesses temporal rule, no son of Levi ministers at God's altar.⁵ There is therefore no violence done to the sacred text, nor any want of due reverence, in supposing that some other prophecies may not await any fulfilment according to the letter. And if it be urged that the particular examples given above are limited by attendant circumstances, or the force of other equally important texts, we answer that a like limitation may be reasonably shown to exist with respect to some of those passages which are said to prove the future restoration of the Jews to Canaan.

(f.) The 'theory of the double sense,' as it has been called, is all but universally recognised among students of Holy Scripture. It has been put forth with much force and clearness by the late Dr. Arnold, in two valuable and very uncontroversial sermons. Without, however, going the whole length of his system (for he inclines somewhat *too* exclusively to the spiritual meaning), we would ask whether it is not a general canon of interpretation, that where a prophecy has already

¹ Morris's Essay towards the conversion of the Hindus, p. 134. He quotes S. Cyril, cont. Julian. *ἐπερ ἐστὶ Θεοῦ πρωτότοκος δ' Ἰσραὴλ, ἔχει πάντως πού καὶ ἀδελφοὺς ἑτέρους, ὡς ὑπὸ πατέρα τὸν Θεόν.*

² See 1 Chron. v. 1, 2; and Gen. xlviii. 21, 22.

³ 2 Samuel vii. 12—16. 1 Chron. xvii. 11—15. Ps. lxxix.

⁴ Exod. xl. 15. Numb. xxv. 13.

⁵ Of the one pretended exception to the truth of this latter statement, a friend, on whom we can rely, writes as follows: 'The Jews in Poland *think* that they have an hereditary priesthood, and that the descent has been faithfully preserved. This is not an universal opinion; and, of course, can be nothing more than an opinion: for in the destruction of Jerusalem the genealogies were destroyed.'

received *one* fulfilment, and that a *literal* one, we may most safely expect its *second* accomplishment to be *spiritual*?¹ For instance, commentators of great mark have seen in the triumphs of him 'that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah,' a primary allusion to the victories of Judas Maccabæus. But the English (and indeed the entire Western) Church, on the Monday before Easter, most plainly sanctions that spiritual sense of the chapter which the early Fathers with one voice proclaim. If this principle have any truth, let it be applied to the predictions of those prophets who lived either before or during the captivity in Babylon. Their promises of a return *have been once fulfilled* in the letter; are they not now awaiting a far nobler fulfilment in the spirit?

(g.) Last among these our would-be 'aids to reflection,' shall be named a consideration, which, in importance, must rank perhaps as the very first. In attempting to fix a meaning upon the frequently obscure sayings of prophecy, it is surely only natural to gain a clue, if it be possible, from the light which is shed forth in the New Testament. The Apocalypse, it is true, may be fully as dark as the visions of Ezekiel, both being books of prophecy; but this cannot be said of the Gospels and Epistles. Any plain texts in these last, or in the Acts, should surely be allowed great weight in the formation of our decision. Yet, obvious as this rule may seem, there is none perhaps more entirely lost sight of by our present popular school of prophetic interpretation. One might think that its disciples had never heard of the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Galatians, so utterly do they ignore them in their inquiries. But would it be an unfit preparation for research into the true signification of ancient prophecies, for the student to remind himself that it is to *Christians* (and not in any way to Jews, *as such*,) that are addressed those striking words; 'Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.' Even the Apocalypse is plain in its usage of these hallowed names; 'the city of my God, new Jerusalem,' 'the holy city, new Jerusalem;' 'and lo! a lamb stood on the Mount Sion.'² Then, as if to warn us against confounding the temporal with the eternal city, S. Paul has made a special contrast between the 'Jerusalem which now is,' and the 'Jerusalem which is above, the mother of us all.'³ Moreover, he assures

¹ Would not this seem natural even according to the course of *human* thought?

'Put out the light, and then—put out the light:—

The first sense is literal, but it is the *figurative* light that Othello refers to in the *second* place.

² Heb. xii. 22. Rev. iii. 12; xxi. 2.

³ Gal. iv. 25.

us in the same Epistle that 'they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham;' and again, 'If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise.' There are many passages, which a painstaking reader—if we be fortunate enough to find such—would do well to compare with the above. Such are, for example, Acts iii. 24, Romans ix. 24—33, and 1 S. Peter i. 10—12. But we must here content ourselves with a single illustration of the bearing of this class of texts. We open the Bible at the thirty-first chapter of the book of the Prophet Jeremiah. It is full of local allusions; Samaria and Mount Ephraim, Ramah and the land of Judah, stand conspicuously prominent, and it closes with mention of the tower of Hananeel, the hill Gareb, and the brook Kidron. Any promise, then, herein made 'to the house of Israel and the house of Judah' is a promise (it may be argued) to the *literal* Jews and Israelites; otherwise it would not be placed in the very heart and centre, as it were, of such numerous references to definite spots in Palestine. And such argument would appear sound, and probably be irrefragable, were the *Old Testament* the sole heritage of Christians. But what a flood of light is poured upon the entire chapter, and through it upon the language of prophecy at large, when we discover, from the inspired commentary of the Epistle to the Hebrews¹ that the 'new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah' means *the Christian covenant*; that the great twofold gift of justification and sanctification, so distinctly promised through Jeremiah, could never have been intended to be granted to the sons of Israel by mere earthly descent, but to the true Israelites, who have been made such in Christ Jesus, 'that the righteousness of the law,' says the Apostle, 'might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.' Surely, just as the condescension of our Lord, in explaining the first and the second of his parables, has given us a key to all the rest, even so, too, a few words of his Apostles may open many doors of interpretation, which must otherwise have been completely shut. Let it once be thoroughly impressed upon the student's mind that the word 'Israel' is so spiritualised under the Gospel that S. Paul actually adds the phrase 'after the flesh,' when he would designate his kinsmen as distinguished from the 'Israel of God,' and will not his views of the predictions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel and their fellow-prophets assume a very different aspect? '*A careful examination of the context,*' says a learned Orientalist already cited, 'will, I think, generally show that such passages as are most strong *at first sight* for the

¹ Chap. viii. 8—13.

'return of the Jews in a literal outward sense, are to be understood of the Jews in a spiritual sense, the Jews which are Jews inwardly, and children of the faith of Abraham. This, I think, would be the result of such examination, if made by a person ignorant of the opinions of the Fathers and others upon the subject.' With this expression of opinion we perfectly agree, and would only add that the force of the context is then peculiarly strong, when it involves some condition (as, for example, the restoration of the rule of David) which no one has ever taken literally. And here it is time to conclude these general considerations. We may subsequently, perhaps, apply them to the examination of a few passages of the prophetic writings—a few only, for the decision arrived at upon one or two will be generally found to fix the judgment on the rest.

But to those who have any diffidence in their own judgment it would be a real joy and comfort to ascertain, if possible, the sentiments of the general mind of Christendom. The performance of this task is, we must repeat, very far beyond our powers; but much assistance may be derived, as has been intimated, from the labours of some learned writers, whose names shall be set down below.² To all of them we shall lie under the greatest obligations, though we have not ventured on the dangerous plan of accepting either their results or their quotations upon trust.

Such materials as we have collected appear to fall naturally under the four following heads.

I. The sentiments of the leading Fathers, who have been

¹ Morris on Conversion of Hindus, p. 252.

² Our chief aids as indicators (and, in some cases, quoters) of passages, bearing upon this subject, have been as follows. 1. Estius, Comment. in D. Paul. Epist. (see especially on Rom. xi.): and again, more fully, the same writer in lib. iv. Sentent. Distinct. 47, § 11, 12, (tom. iv. p. 541, ed. Paris, A. D. 1701.) He treats his thesis with his usual depth and dignity; though, in the last-named work, rather too scholastically. 2. Spencer ad Origenem cont. Celsum, lib. iv., a copious and valuable note. The Benedictine editors have given it in their edition (tom. i. p. 516). 3. Stücker, in his Thesaurus (sub voce *Ἰουδαῖος*) furnishes some useful additional matter, but is not very copious nor discriminating. 4. Morris, besides the very valuable hints given above, is most useful in indicating the indicators. His appeal to Josephus seems questionable. 5. Dr. Pusey indirectly touches upon the question in a note (on the Millennium) to the Oxford Translation of Tertullian, (vol. i. p. 120 *seq.*) Of this note it is enough to say that in richness, completeness, and mastery over its materials, it is entirely worthy of its author. 6. In favour of the temporal restoration may be named, Nath. Homes, D.D., 'The Resurrection Revealed,' A. D. 1654, (re-published in London, A. D. 1833,) a book of some curiosity and learning; 'Tracts for the Jews,' by the Rev. A. S. Thelwall, M.A. Lond. 1847; the best statement of the arguments on that side that we have seen. Many works of the kind (e.g. Mr. Whittaker Churton's 'Land of the Morning,') appear rather to *assume* than *prove* the point. 7. The more obvious sources of information, as the works of Eusebius, Socrates, S. Bernard, Pascal, Lowth, Vitringa, Cornelius à Lapide, Milman, Gibbon, Rev. G. Williams, and others, will be referred to in their proper places.

supposed to countenance the idea of the restoration of the Jews to Palestine.

II. The expressions of other great doctors, who may not seem to have ruled the question upon either side.

III. The tone of feeling exhibited in some acts of Jews or Christians at particular epochs in history.

IV. The opinions of distinguished authors, patristic, or of later ages, in favour of the views here advocated; viz., a spiritual interpretation of the prophecies concerning Israel, a belief in the ultimate conversion of the Jews, but *not* in their national re-existence.

I. The Fathers whose authority has been claimed in support of the view taken by the Jews themselves, are, we need scarcely say, those among the Ante-Nicene writers who have expressed their belief in the Millennium. The great names are those of S. Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, and Tertullian. Indeed we are not aware that the other supporters of a Millenarian view have said anything that bears very closely upon our present subject; but, in any case, the views and arguments of minor teachers, (as e.g. the Egyptian Bishop, Nepos, mentioned by Eusebius,¹) would probably stand or fall with these.

Now we must not suffer ourselves to be betrayed into the discussion of the *vexata quæstio* of the Millennium. Thus much, however, we may say, in passing, that the remarks of Dr. Charles Maitland, in his valuable 'Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation,' have not sufficed to balance, in our judgment, the weight of the counter-arguments derivable from the writings of S. Jerome and S. Augustine,² of our own Hammond, in his commentary on Revelation xx., and of Dr. Chr. Wordsworth in his Lectures on the Apocalypse. The reasoning of the last-named divine appears to us, in this respect, peculiarly forcible; and we may say this without danger of appearing to sympathise with the main portion of his work, as the *Christian Remembrancer* has already expressed its opinion thereon.³ But let this pass. We maintain, that even the Chiliast doctrine, which found favour with these above-named Fathers, is something totally distinct from the modern teaching concerning the hoped-for restoration of the Jews; that their works support no such view, but, on the contrary, rather make against it; and that *the appeal to their authority on the part of our opponents is consequently mistaken and irrelevant.*

And, in the first place, let us look at those passages which

¹ Hist. Ecclesiast. vii. 24.

² S. Hieron in Ezechiel xx., *et alibi*. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. xx.

³ In the number for October, A. D. 1853, vol. xxvi. p. 383.

seem most strongly to espouse the Judaic interpretation. In the well-known dialogue of S. Justin Martyr with Trypho, we read as follows (our translation is designedly literal):

'But tell me, do ye truly confess that this place, Jerusalem, shall be rebuilt; and do ye expect that your people shall be gathered together and be in joy with Christ, with the Patriarchs, and the Prophets, and those either of our race, or who became proselytes before your Christ came, or hast thou had recourse to the admission of these points, that thou mayest seem to overcome us in disputations?'

'And I answered, I am not so wretched, O Trypho, as to speak differently from what I think. I have, therefore, already admitted to thee, that I and many others think thus, as ye also fully know will come to pass; and I have intimated that many, on the other hand, of the Christians, who hold pure and religious opinions, do not admit this. . . . But I, and the Christians, who are in all respects orthodox, know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, built and adorned and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and the rest confess.'¹

Now it is clear that no hint is given in this passage that S. Justin, and those who agreed with him upon the subject of the Millennium, expected that this restored Jerusalem would be in any way devoted to the possession of such Christians only as had been of Jewish birth, far less to any Jews who remained in an unconverted state. If Jews were to be there, it was only those who had died before the coming of our Lord, or who, since that first advent, had accepted the faith of the Cross. Between this idea and the one popularly received and preached on behalf of the Operative Jewish Converts' Institution, there is not merely a distinction, but an irreconcilable opposition. The modern teachers look for a Jerusalem occupied by terrestrial Jews, who shall enjoy again a distinct national and political existence; S. Justin expected a Jerusalem inhabited by the faithful of all times and nations, in which the re-risen Patriarchs and the converted Israelites would find indeed their proper place, but nothing more.

There is, however, a previous passage in the same dialogue which ought, likewise, in fairness, to be quoted.

'And those two goats on the fast day bidden to be alike, of which one was sent away and the other made an offering, were an announcement of the two advents of Christ: of the one in which the elders and priests of your people led him forth as one sent away, laying their hands upon him and putting him to death; and again of his second advent, *when in this same place of Jerusalem, ye shall acknowledge him who was dishonoured by you*, and became an offering for all sinners, who desire to repent and to keep that fast which Isaiah describes, "loosing the bonds of wicked covenants," and observing the other things alike enumerated by him, and which I also have recounted, which they who believe in Jesus perform.'²

¹ Dial. cum Tryph. cap. 80, (tom. ii. pp. 272—6. Ed. Otto.)

² Ibid. cap. 40.

Yet here, again, we perceive nothing that would encourage hopes of national re-existence; though the far more blessed prospect of national repentance seems held out, not perhaps without some thought in the writer's mind of such passages as Zech. xii. 10, and S. Matt. xxiii. 37—39. But as nothing more to the point can be produced, the claim to the authority of S. Justin must be pronounced to be void and futile.

We turn to the pages of S. Irenæus. In his great work *Adversus Hæreses* (lib. v. cap. 35), he likewise adopts the *literal* interpretation of the thousand years predicted by S. John in Rev. xx. 4, and argues against that figurative sense which Origen, Jerome, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Augustine, have since made (we think most justly) the more generally received and triumphant one.

‘But the whole of this cannot be understood of what is super-celestial . . . but in the days of the kingdom, when the earth is restored by Christ, and Jerusalem rebuilt according to the pattern which is above: Jerusalem of which saith the Prophet Isaiah, “Behold I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands: thy walls are continually before me.”’¹

But a moment's glance at the context must effectually dispel the notion that this primitive writer was thinking, when he thus wrote, of a restoration of the Jewish nationality. The inhabitants of the re-built Jerusalem are to be, in his opinion, ‘as many of the believers as God hath provided for this’—(*quotquot ex credentibus ad hoc præparavit Deus*) and it is to take place under the reign of the saints. There is not a single word which is calculated to foster the belief that Jews would have any special advantage through their lineal descent from Abraham.

Tertullian is likewise classed among the Millenarium divines. In his treatise against Marcion, he represents his opponent as charging our Lord with promising to the Jews their former condition as about to ensue from the restitution of their country.² The reply of Tertullian will be more properly supplied in one of our after sections. Enough for the present to observe, that the joys of *his* Jerusalem are represented as purely spiritual, and intended for Christians in compensation for those pleasures which in the world they have either despised or lost.³

But though dismissing Tertullian for the present, we cannot afford thus to part with Justin or with Irenæus. For if it could

¹ ‘Hæc autem talia universa non in supercoelestibus possunt intelligi—sed in Regni temporibus, revocatâ terrâ à Christo et reædificatâ Hierusalem secundum characterem quæ sursum est Hierusalem, de quâ ait Propheta Isaias,’ &c. (Isa. xlix. 16.) For convenience we give S. Irenæus' texts from our version, there being no substantial variation.

² ‘Cæterum vester Christus pristinum statum Judæis pollicetur ex restitutione terræ,’ &c.—Tertull. adv. Marcionem, lib. iii. cap. 24, (p. 412, ed. Wirceburgi, A. D. 1780.)

³ Ibid.

be shown that these ancient writers had, like some modern divines, ignored S. Paul's use of the term 'Israel'—if they had seen but a scanty fulfilment of ancient prophecy in the blessings and privileges of Christ's Church—then might it at least be plausibly argued, that although not in letter and detail supporters of the belief in Jewish national restoration, they were *virtually* such, as sympathising with the kind of interpretation which ultimately induces such belief. But it does happen, that perhaps few writers have more clearly exhibited their strong sense of that spiritual descent from Abraham to which all true Christians may lay claim; and S. Irenæus is likewise very copious in appropriation of prophecy to the Church. These facts appear to us of such importance, as regards the present argument, that we shall, we trust, be pardoned for asking the attention of the reader to some extracts of considerable length. The blending of the *earthly* with the *spiritual* Jerusalem—the holy confidence in our present reception of God's promised gifts—will be found to deserve especial notice.

Here follow the words of S. Justin in the dialogue already referred to:—

'For the true, spiritual, Israelitish race, of Judah and Jacob and Isaac and of Abraham (who in circumcision received testimony and blessing from God upon his faith, and was called "father of many nations"), *are we, who have been led to God through this crucified Christ.*'¹

'Come with me, all that fear God, who wish to see the good things of Jerusalem. Come let us walk in the light of the Lord, for he hath freed his people, the house of Jacob. Come, all ye Gentiles, let us be gathered together *into Jerusalem, no longer besieged for the iniquities of her people.* . . . They, too, will desire to inherit with you, be it but a little space, who justify themselves and say that they are the sons of Abraham. And Trypho, "What is it that thou sayest, that none of us shall inherit anything in the holy Mountain of God?" And I; "I say not this, but they who have persecuted and still persecute Christ, and repent not, they shall inherit nothing in the holy mountain; but the Gentiles that have believed on Him and repented of the sins they have committed, these shall inherit with the patriarchs and the prophets and the just who have sprung from Jacob, even though they do not keep Sabbaths, nor are circumcised, nor keep the feasts, yet shall they assuredly inherit the holy inheritance of God."²

One more passage only, but one of much argumentative force, shall be given from the same source as the preceding:—

'Now we are not only a people, but likewise a holy people, as we have already shown. "And they shall call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord." (Isa. lxii. 12.) Wherefore we are no despicable nation nor barbarous tribe, nor such as the Carian and Phrygian races, but us also hath God chosen, and hath become manifest to them that sought Him not. "Behold," saith He, "I am God to the nation who have not called

¹ Dial. cum Tryph. cap. 11.

² Ibid. cap. 24—26, (tom. pp. 81—87. Ed. Otto.)

upon my name." (Isa. lxxv. 1. nearly thus in the LXX.) *For this is that nation which God promised of old to Abraham*, announcing that He would make him "a father of many nations," (Gen. xvii. 5,) not referring to the Arabians, nor Egyptians, nor Idumeans: since even Ishmael became the father of a great nation, and likewise Esau, and there exists a vast multitude of Ammonites. Moreover, Noah was the father of Abraham himself, and in fact of the entire human race, and other men progenitors of others. What higher favour then doth Christ here grant to Abraham? That by a like calling He summoned him with His voice, bidding him go forth out of the land wherein he dwelt. *And all of us hath he called by that voice, and we have now come forth from that conversation (ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας) in which we lived, and lived sinfully, after the common practice of the other inhabitants of the land: and we shall with Abraham inherit the holy land, having to receive our inheritance for eternity, forasmuch as through the like faith we are the children of Abraham.* For just as he believed the voice of God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness, in like manner we also, having believed the voice spoken afresh through the Apostles of Christ, and that preached to us through the prophets, have renounced even unto death all things that are in the world. A nation then of like faith, religious and righteous (θεοσεβὲς καὶ δίκαιον), gladdening its father, God promiseth to him, *but not you, "in whom is no faith."* (Deut. xxxii. 20.)¹

Let us now hear S. Irenæus discourse concerning the father of the faithful.

After quoting Genesis xiii. 14—17, and xv. 18, S. Irenæus proceeds as follows:—

'Thus, therefore, God promised him the inheritance of the land, but he received it not in all his time of sojourn: *He must receive it with his seed (that is, those who fear God and believe in Him) in the resurrection of the just. Now the Church is his seed*, receiving through the Lord the adoption which is towards God, as said John the Baptist, "since God is able² of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Moreover, the Apostle saith in his Epistle to the Galatians, "now ye, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." (Gal. iv. 28.) And, again, in the same Epistle he plainly declares that they who have believed Christ, receive Christ, who was promised to Abraham.'³

He then quotes verses 16 and 6—9, from the third chapter of the same Epistle, and adds:—

'Thus, therefore, those who are of faith shall be blessed with faithful Abraham, and these are the sons of Abraham. But God promised the inheritance of the earth to Abraham and to his seed: and neither Abraham nor his seed (*that is, those who are justified by faith*) now acquire inheritance in it; but they shall receive it in the resurrection of the just. For God is true and stable, and therefore did He say, "blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."⁴

¹ Dial. cum Tryph. cap. 119, (tom. ii. p. 396. Ed. Otto.)

² We have here followed the reading given by Massuet: 'Per dominum adoptionem, quæ est ad Deum, accipiens.' Grabe has 'per Domini adoptionem,' &c., which leaves the participle 'accipiens' without any word governed by it.

³ 'Sic ergo huic promisit Deus hæreditatem terræ, non accepit autem in omni suo incolatu, oportet eam accipere cum semine suo, hoc est, qui timent Deum et credunt in eum, in resurrectione justorum. Semen autem ejus Ecclesia, per Dominum adoptionem, quæ est ad Deum, accipiens,' &c.

⁴ 'Sic ergo qui sunt ex fide benedicentur cum fideli Abraham, et hi sunt filii

Much more will be found to the same effect. We will content ourselves with a single addition to the above. Having cited Isaiah xxx. 25, 26, S. Irenæus comments upon the latter part of the 26th verse. ('In the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound:' in his version, the *pain* of the wound or stroke, *dolorem plagæ*.)

'Now the pain of the stroke is that by which man was struck 'in the beginning, through disobedient Adam; that is, death, 'which God will heal, raising us from the dead, *and restoring us 'into the inheritance of our fathers*; as again Isaiah saith, "then 'shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee 'to ride upon the high places of the earth, *and feed thee with the 'heritage of Jacob thy father*; for the mouth of the Lord hath 'spoken it." But since the promises were proclaimed *not only 'to the Prophets and Fathers, but also to the Churches gathered to- 'gether out of the Gentiles* (which the Holy Spirit likewise terms 'the isles).¹ Jeremiah speaks as follows, [Jer. xxxi. 10—15.]—

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations,
And declare it in the isles afar off, and say,
He that scattered Israel will gather him,
And keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock.
For the Lord hath redeemed Jacob,
And ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he.
Therefore shall they come and sing in the height of Zion,
And shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, &c."

S. Irenæus adv. Hæreses, v. 34. (Ed. Grabe.)

S. Irenæus subsequently quotes in the same spirit Isaiah xxxi. 9; xxxii. 1; liv. 11—14, and lxxv. 18—23. The consideration of these passages will be found to throw light upon the views entertained by this ancient writer; for all, and especially the last, are replete with local references.

And here we must conclude our first section, simply remarking, that if any one, who has imbibed the spirit of such passages as the above, will compare their tone with that of the crowd of publications upon prophecy, which, wave-like ('*velut unda supervenit undam*'), rush over each other, as they issue from the

Abraham. Repromisit autem Deus hæreditatem terræ Abraham et semini ejus: et neque Abraham neque semen ejus (*hoc est, qui ex fide, justificantur*) nunc sumunt in eâ hæreditatem: accipient autem in resurrectione justorum. Verus enim et firmus Deus, &c.'

¹ 'Dolor autem plagæ est, per quam percussus est homo initio in Adam inobediens, hoc est, mors, quam sanabit Deus resuscitans nos à mortuis et restituens in patrum hæreditatem, quemadmodum iterum Isaias ait (lviii. 14). . . . Quoniam autem repromissiones *non solum Prophetis et Patribus, sed Ecclesiis et Gentibus coadunatis*, annunciabatur, quas et insulas nuncupat Spiritus.' We shall continue to give the original, either partially or in full, according to the rarity, the length, and the importance of the citation, following herein, in our humble way, what we imagine to be the rule laid down for himself by Mr. Grote, in his History of Greece.

press of the Messrs. Seeley, and similar bibliopolists, he will be struck with the utter contrast thus exhibited; and while he gives to the modern writers of his own land the fullest credit for good intentions, he will be conscious of an abrupt and painful descent from a region of thoughts ethereal and full of grandeur, to a land that must seem, in a very sad degree, narrow, earthly, and unspiritual.

II. In selecting a few of the remarks of those writers who, although unclaimed by our opponents, have not pronounced decisively against them, we may very possibly appear to be losing labour. But we are desirous, in the *first* place, of displaying some evidence of the generality of the conviction in favour of Jewish acceptance of our Lord in the latter days: and, *secondly*, of submitting to the reader's judgment the question, whether *the manner* in which these authorities have spoken of the *conversion* of Israel does not, for the most part, preclude the possibility of their having entertained the idea of a temporal restoration? Neither must it be forgotten that mere silence upon all sides affords a negative evidence, which is by no means alien from our inquiry.

Our first citation shall be from the writings of S. Hilary, the famous Bishop of Poitiers in the middle of the fourth century. He has a kind of right to be named first, for so beneficent was he to the race of Israel, that at his funeral 'the Jews were heard chanting in Hebrew their mournful psalms of lamentation for the Christian bishop.' S. Hilary, in a passage which defies, we must own, our powers of full and exact construing, but of which the leading thought is sufficiently transparent, speaks as follows:—

'They are enemies indeed for our sakes, but beloved for the fathers' sakes: *the remnant of them is reserved for mercy*. Meantime they are dispersed among almost all nations, but by holy sprinkling shall they be set free.'¹

And presently he continues:—

'And their impiety being laid aside, they shall be plucked away from lying and the curse, *and this in the consummation*: for when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in, then the remnant of Israel shall be saved. *But meanwhile the punishment of their desolation and dispersion awaits them*: although, for the fathers and the elect's sakes, this dispensation of mercy is reserved for the general consummation.'²

¹ Milman, *Hist. of Jews*, vol. iii. p. 200.

² 'Inimici quidem propter nos, sed dilecti propter patres: misericordiæ id quod eorum est reliquum reservatur. Dispersi quidem interim circum omnes ferè gentes, sed conspersione eorum sancta *atque radice* liberabuntur.' S. Hilarius in Psalmum lviii. Enaratio (pp. 487, 488. Ed. Basileæ, A. D. 1850). Another edition, printed at Würzburg, reads *æque* for *atque*; but this is no improvement, and the *Ed. Wirceburgi* is not of high authority.

³ 'Aversâque impietate de execratione ac mendacio avellentur, et *hoc in con-*

Now taking into account the confidence of the statement in one respect, and the entire absence of any like announcement in the writings of that saintly Prelate respecting a return of Israel into the *local* Palestine—observing how, in his judgment, even the conversion is reserved for the consummation of all things—we shall hardly be accused of forced or tortuous reasoning, if we assert that S. Hilary must be considered to favour the interpretations here set forth.

From France we must cross over to Egypt—no uncommon transit in these modern days. S. Cyril, the Archbishop of Alexandria at the beginning of the fifth century, ought to have enjoyed peculiar advantages for forming an opinion concerning Jewish hopes and prospects, seeing that he was dwelling in the very midst of one of their most wealthy and learned settlements. He coincides with the *Episcopus Pictaviensis*, just referred to, in speaking plainly on the one point and preserving the deepest silence on the other.

‘That they shall receive mercy in the last times, being justified with us by the grace that is toward Christ the holy Scripture hath proclaimed.’

‘The synagogue of the Jews, which, as it were, rejected Christ and cast Him away by its disobedience, shall receive Him in the latest times, being initiated into the faith by the voices of the Church.’¹

Another name, which must be mentioned at this stage of our inquiry, is that of the great and eloquent bishop and metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia, S. Basil. (His date is a little later than S. Hilary’s; Basil having been raised to the episcopate in A.D. 370, Hilary about A.D. 350.) He, too, has been enumerated among those who looked for a final triumph of the Cross over Jewish prejudice.² Of the correctness of such nomination we are not fully satisfied, but S. Basil certainly holds out no hopes of another Israelitish possession of the Holy Land. His *exegesis* of prophecy looks in quite an opposite direction. Witness the two following specimens. Upon the first verse of the fourteenth (our fifteenth) Psalm he observes:—

‘The earthly Jew, when he hears mention of a hill, recurs to Sion.

summatione: quia cū intraverit gentium plenitudo, tūm quicquid Israel est reliquum salvabitur.—*Sed illos interim desolationis et dispersionis suae manet poena*: tamet si consummationi temporum propter patres et electos hæc dispensatio misericordiae reservetur.—*Ibid.*

¹ ‘Ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάτοις ἐλεηθήσονται καιροῖς, τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν χάριτι μεθ’ ἡμῶν δικαιοῦμενοι διεκήρυξε τὸ γράμμα τὸ ἱερὸν.—S. Cyrilus Alexandr. in cap. i. Jesaie ad ver. 14, 15 (cit. ap. Suicer.) ‘Ἐκθεμένη ὥσπερ τῶν Ἰησοῦν ἡ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγή, καὶ ἀποβαλοῦσα ταῖς ἀπειθείαις, ἐν τελευταίοις αὐτῶν καιροῖς παραδέξεται, ταῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυσταγωγουμένη φωναῖς.—*Id.* lib. i. Glaphyra in Exod. p. 252 (cit. *ibid.*)

² Estius on Romans xi. thus mentions him. We have not been able to discover the passage, but Estius is usually so accurate, that the fact may very probably lie with us.

"Who shall dwell in thy holy hill?" he who hath lived as a sojourner in the flesh, he shall dwell in the holy hill; that hill, the land above the heavens, the land conspicuous and bright, concerning which the Apostle saith, that ye are come unto Mount Sion, the mount of the living God, wherein is the assembly of angels, and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.¹

Commenting upon Isaiah iii. 10 ("they shall eat the fruit of their doings"), S. Basil alludes to the Jews leading Jesus bound unto Caiaphas (S. John xviii. 24), and proceeds as follows:—

'Now these are the fruits of their doings—captivity, dispersion, overthrow of the temple, the fall from their glory, their shame of countenance that permitteth them not to look up to God, by reason of the sin against the Only-begotten. Therefore have they lost their former boldness of speech, having neither prophets nor worship; but having bound the word, having bound the truth, having bound the light, having bound righteousness; having bound the Saviour, having bound the liberator (for Christ is all these according to the various ways in which we regard Him), they are deprived of light, they are deprived of the word, they are deprived of truth; they dwell with unrighteousness, their sickness is incurable. These are the fruits of their doings, which they eat.'²

The last whom we shall select from the list of those whom we believe we might justly include under the present category, shall be the greatest doctor of the Western Church, Aurelian Augustine. It may indeed be questioned whether the language of S. Austin does not express sentiments of so decided a nature as to class him with a different set of authorities—those, namely, who have *openly* testified their disbelief in what may be termed the *local* theory. But we have no desire to press evidence unduly, and prefer to be on the safe side. The following is but one out of many similar declarations of this Father:—

'Now that those carnal Israelites who now refuse to believe in Christ shall afterwards believe, that is to say, their sons (for they in truth will pass to their own place by death), the same prophet [Hosea] beareth

¹ Ἰουδαῖος μὲν ὁ γῆινος ὅταν ὁρος ἀκούσῃ, πρὸς τὸν Σιών ἀποτρέχει· τίς κατασκηνώσει ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ σου; ὁ τῇ σαρκὶ παροικήσας, ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει κατασκηνώσει, ὁρος ἐκείνο τὴν ὑπερουράνιον χώραν, τὴν περὶφανῆ καὶ λαμπράν· περὶ οὗ ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει, ὅτι προσελθύθατε Σιών ὁρος θεοῦ ζώντος Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίην, ἐν ᾗ πανήγυρις ἀγγέλων, καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς.—S. Basilus, Homilia in Psalmum xiv. (xv.) (Tom. i. pp. 352, 353, Ed. Ben.) The text from Hebrews (xii. 22, 23) is probably quoted from memory, and therefore without precise exactness.

² ταῦτα δὲ ἐκείνων τῶν ἔργων τὰ γεννήματα, ἡ αἰχμαλωσία, ἡ διασπορά, ἡ καταστροφή τῶν ναοῦ, ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης κατάρπτωσις, ἡ ἀσχύνη τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔωσα αὐτοὺς πρὸς θεὸν ἀναβλέπειν, διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸν μονογενῆ ἁμαρτίαν, ἀπώλεσαν οὖν τὴν προτέραν παρρησίαν, μήτε προφήτας, μήτε λατρείαν ἔχοντες· δῆσαντες δὲ τὸν λόγον, δῆσαντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, δῆσαντες τὸ φῶς, δῆσαντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, δῆσαντες τὸν σωτήρα, δῆσαντες τὸν ἱατρόν, δῆσαντες τὸν ἐλευθερωτήν· ἅπερ πάντα ἐστὶ κατὰ ποικίλην τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίνοιαν ὁ Χριστός· ἐστέρηται φῶς, ἐστέρηται λόγος, ἐστέρηται ἀληθεία· ἀδικία συζῶσιν, ἀνιάτα νοσοῦσιν. ταῦτα ἐστὶ τὰ γεννήματα τῶν ἔργων, ἃ ἐσθίουσιν.—S. Basilus in Esai. Proph. cap. iii. (Ed. Ben.)

witness saying, "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, without an altar, without a priesthood, without teraphim." Who cannot see that the Jews are at present in this state. But let us hear what he adds: "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." *Nothing can be plainer than this prophecy*, when by the name of "*David, the king*," is understood to be meant Christ, "who was made," as saith the Apostle, "of the seed of David according to the flesh."¹

In another passage of the same great work, (a passage so often quoted, as to be almost trite and hackneyed to those who have given much attention to the subject) S. Augustine quotes Malachi iv. 5, 6, and then proceeds as follows:—

'It is a subject of most constant converse and meditation with the faithful, that the Jews (the law having been explained to them by this Elias, the great and marvellous prophet) will, in the last time before the judgment, believe in the true Christ, that is to say, in our Christ.'

The reader will observe that a new element is here introduced, namely, an announcement of the particular means by which the ultimate conversion of the Jews was looked for, the return of Elijah to the earth. Now, were we disposed to play the part of special pleaders, a collection of the expressions of ancient writers upon this head might greatly aid our cause. For it would well-nigh double our list of writers, who belong to this second division, as having spoken plainly of the *spiritual* change expected to come over Judaism, while they totally ignored the idea of the local theory. But such a course would involve many disadvantages. Not only would it lengthen an inquiry already only too protracted, but it would mix up with our leading positions another of a somewhat different character. For although the expectation of Elias (accompanied, as some thought, by Enoch, or according to others, by Moses) is largely supported by patristic authority, and may probably have more countenance from Holy Writ than might be thought at the first glance, yet it does not stand upon precisely the same ground as the main question of the conversion itself. The two points,

¹ 'Istos autem carnales Israelitas, qui nunc nolunt credere in Christum, postea credituros, id est, filios eorum (nam utique isti in suum locum moriendo transibunt) idem Propheta testatur, dicens, &c. (Hosea iii. 4, the last words being in his version 'sine altari, sine sacerdotio, sine manifestationibus.') Quis non videat nunc sic esse Judæos? Sed quid adjungat audiamus (Hos. iii. 5. The conclusion is perhaps still more forcible than the E. V. given above: '*et stupeacent in Domino et in bonis ejus in novissimis diebus.*') *Nihil est ista prophetia manifestius*, cum David regis nomine significatus intelligatur Christus, &c.' (Rom. i. 3.) —De Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. cap. 28.

² 'Per hunc Eliam magnum mirabilemque prophetam exposita sibi lege, ultimo tempore ante judicium Judæos in Christum verum, id est in Christum nostrum, esse credituros, celeberrimum est in sermonibus cordibusque fidelium.'—De Civ. Dei. Lib. xx. cap. 29, (tom. vii. p. 613. Ed. Ben.) We translate with more freedom where the original is given as a check to undue license.

indeed, are often thus classed together by the ancients, but in subsequent ages the return of Elijah has been a matter of controversy, as the theological student may perceive by referring to the acrimonious comments of Maldonatus upon S. Matthew xvii. 10—12, which are directed *contra Calvinistas*. This is, with us, a reason for avoiding the topic for the present. Nevertheless, we must venture for other reasons to make one more quotation from the *De Civitate Dei*, in which this coming of the ascended prophet is mentioned with much confidence:—

‘We have taught, then, that in that judgment, or in close connexion with that judgment, the following events will happen. The coming of Elijah the Tishbite; the conversion of the Jews; the persecution of Antichrist; the judgment by Christ; the resurrection of the dead; the separation of the good and the wicked; the conflagration of the world, and the renewal of the same. That all these things will come to pass is matter of faith; *but in what way or in what order they will happen, experience of facts will then teach, better than men’s wits can now avail perfectly to attain to*. I think, however, that they will happen in that order in which I have considered them.’¹

It must be owned that this is but a scanty list, when compared with the multitudinous array of events which the disciples of the modern school of prophecy place before us. They do not limit their decypherings of the future by that modest reference to the ‘*experientia rerum*,’ which S. Austin here names as the great test of truth. Their large and extended range of vision includes alike the precise date of the world’s end, and the duration of the Turkish Empire. True it is, that their predictions have again and again been falsified. The world has outlasted Whiston’s assignation of its limit by the space of a century and a half: and the Ottoman rule in Europe (which Mr. Elliott, in the first edition of his ‘*Horæ Apocalypticæ*,’ had told us would cease and determine in the year of grace 1849,) has obtained in A. D. 1854 not merely the support of an Anglo-French alliance, but likewise a further grant of existence at the hands of no less a personage than the famous Dr. Cumming, who allows it the space of ten years more from the present time. But what of that? If this last calculation fail, the horoscope can be set again, and a fresh race of purchasers will easily be found. To us, we must confess, their tortuous, forced, and unauthorized explanations of God’s Word but too often remind us rather of the tricks of pretended divination, than any sober and rational

¹ ‘In illo itaque judicio vel circa illud judicium has res didicimus esse venturas, Eliam Thesbiten, fidem Judæorum, Antichristum persecuturum, Christum judicaturum, mortuorum resurrectionem, bonorum malorumque diremptionem, mundi conflagrationem, ejusdemque renovationem. Quæ omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est: sed quibus modis et quo ordine veniant, magis tunc docebit rerum experientia, quam nunc valet consequi ad perfectum hominum intelligentia. Existimo tamen eo, quo à me commemorata sunt, ordine easse ventura.’—*De Civ. Dei*, lib. xx. cap. ult. (Tom. vii, p. 617, Ed. Ben.)

system of Christian *exegesis*. We have no great trust in political prophecy of any kind. Even the wisest statesmen are constantly found at fault, when they attempt it. But if we *must* take our choice, we avow frankly that the strong practical sense even of a Cobbett, is in our eyes more trustworthy than the *dictum* of any disciple of Bishop Newton.¹ The reprint of Cobbett's letters upon the formation of the kingdom of Greece, displays a real insight into probabilities, which, though the writer did not live to see them, have now become actualities. And the same might be said of many remarks of Arnold's and even of Alison's. But amidst the countless vaticinations of the school referred to, what proportion has been found to cast any real light upon the waves before us?

We know that these objections may give great offence to some, who demand for the most earthly and fallible interpretations of the Bible the reverence which is due to the Sacred Volume itself. But do they abide by their own rule? Will they treat with deference that notable argument which showed from Scripture, that the Papacy excelled the Imperial Power, *because* the first chapter of Genesis calls the Sun the *greater*, and the Moon the *lesser* light? Yet in what respect is this reasoning *more* forced than that of a writer, who first *assumes* (in direct opposition to all Jewish and all Christian commentators) that the 'Stone cut out without hands' in Daniel ii. 34, 45, is the British Empire, then imagines that his readers may reasonably be surprised at the idea of Great Britain absorbing all other kingdoms, and finally attempts to pacify them by gravely quoting the words, 'hath He said, and shall He not do it?' As if the very question at stake were not *whether He had said it*.

Strange, that the many excellent men who have adopted this mode of interpretation, are not made to pause by their reiterated failures, and led to suspect that there may be something unsound at the very basis of their structures. Such suspicion, however, does not seem to cross their minds, or if it arise, is immediately set aside again. Prejudices of education have often entwined the system with their entire inward life; or their own ingenuity, even if questionable, is too dear to let them re-commence on another plan; and when we see men of sense and ability thus hampered and entangled, we bethink us of the striking apologue which a living poet has placed in the mouth of the medieval mystic, Paracelsus. He likens himself to men

¹ Some readers may be put in mind of the second book of Cicero's *de Divinatione*. 'Num igitur, aut quæ tempestas impendeat, vates melius conjiciet, quam gubernator; aut morbi naturam acutius, quam medicus; aut belli administrationem, prudentius, quam Imperator, conjecturâ assequetur?' (Cap. v. *ad init.*)

who had to carry statues to distant isles, well worthy of the intended decoration. Tired of their long voyage, they land too soon upon wrong shores, and commence making shrines for the images; when the inhabitants of the true islands appear, and beg them to come on, for it is but a little way, and the groves are ready for the reception of these majestic forms:—

‘Then we awoke with sudden start
From our deep dream; we knew too late
How bare the rock, how desolate,
To which we had flung our precious freight:
Yet we call’d out, “Depart!
Our gifts, once given, must here abide:
Our work is done; we have no heart
To mar our work, though vain” —we cried.’¹

And here perhaps the reader will expect some notice of the book which is placed at the commencement of this article. But if the length of our extracts from the works of men great in their generation, has already tried his patience, we must not run the risk of hopelessly annihilating what yet remains, by entering into much detail concerning a production of such very inferior and common-place character. The praise of good intentions on its author’s part we willingly allow, but when we have said that, our meed of commendation is at an end. One or two specimens of the way in which this school of interpreters ‘determine, from Scripture and from history,’ the events of the future, will amply justify the brevity of our criticism.

In the first edition it was stated as probable that ‘before the end of 1844 the Turkish Empire, or the reign of Moham-
‘medanism shall have ceased.’—P. 25. The second edition insinuates, that this announcement was practically fulfilled, inasmuch as in that year the Five Great Powers compelled Turkey to abandon the persecution of Christianity and Christian converts. But is it to be believed that this was anything like the sense which the Author had intended to convey? And if he *did* mean thus much, and no more, what value are we to attach to his auguries of what is still future?

In order to prove that the East India Company is to be ‘the righteous power from the East,’ foretold by the Prophet Isaiah, (xli. 1, 2,) our good deeds—on which a writer in the present number of this review speaks with some authority—in Hindostan are trumpeted forth, while nearly all that is bad or questionable is passed entirely *sub silentio*. Indeed, there are only two classes of persons, from whom so sycophantic an account of the rule of the Kings of Leadenhall Street could have proceeded: the one, the

¹ Lest we should seem to any to have misquoted, it must be observed that the wording of this passage differs in different editions of Mr. Browning’s difficult, but really (we believe) deep and philosophic poem.

penmen who are writing for political and party purposes, the other, these modern students of unfulfilled prophecy. Compelled by the stern exigencies of their theories to state or ignore facts, just as may be suited to the scheme proposed, they treat the past as something entirely subservient to their own peculiar views of the future. When we have learnt to consider the stone cut out without hands which Daniel saw, to be the empire of Great Britain; when we are fully convinced that S. John the Divine means by the 'voices' of Revelation (xvi. 18.) 'quarrels, such as the quarrel with America about the burning of the ship *'Caroline, &c.'* (p. 361); when we think it probable that Jonah in seeking to flee to Tarshish intended to flee to the British isles; then—but not till then—shall we look forward to the restoration of Israel to Palestine, at the hands of the East India Company. It is difficult to speak gravely of these interpretations of Holy Writ: nevertheless there are aspects in which they become very grave and very sad: for, while they may foster in those who trust them an eager, restless, and excited frame of mind, very alien from the true Christian temper, they may be found in other quarters to provoke a spirit of irreverence towards the Sacred Volume itself, and so ultimately tend to unbelief.¹

III. We have proposed to consider the tone of feeling exhibited in some acts of Jews or Christians at particular epochs in history. This portion of our inquiry must of necessity be very meagre and scanty, for, if not compressed, it might be in danger of becoming a sketch of Jewish history.

Now it may be the result of ignorance or prejudice upon our part, but we only know of *three* facts which even *appear* to countenance, in any degree, the notion of a fresh occupation of Palestine by the Jews, in a state of power and political independence. These are 1. Their remarkable preservation as a distinct race; 2. The summoning of the Sanhedrim in Paris, A.D. 1807, by permission, or perhaps rather by command, of Napoleon Buonaparte; and 3. The continuous residence of a certain number in the Holy Land, from the close of the fourteenth century down to the present era. A few words upon each of these.

1. It is evident that the fact of the Jewish race remaining so separate and unmixed, finds its due place in the patristic, as well in the local, theory. If the Jews were to remain as living, though involuntary, witnesses to the truth of the religion and the prophecies of the Crucified; if at last they are to be converted (their own awful imprecation still clinging meanwhile to the unbelieving) it needs *must* be that they continue for the

¹ The argument on the stone just referred to is from this work.

present distinct from the other great families of mankind. It is impossible, therefore, to argue for the probability of their resumption of national independence and their ancient home from this circumstance, unless there be some far more cogent proof derivable from other and less debateable grounds.

2.nd At the summons of the Emperor Napoleon, a Sanhedrim of seventy-one Jewish doctors were gathered together. They were allowed to publish the result of their deliberations, and their brethren were admitted, under certain modifications, to the privileges of the French empire. The most distinguished British historian of the period calls this event a fulfilment of prophecy. We own that we are unable to perceive how this can be the case: and if it be argued that it is a kind of type and pledge of a fuller gathering hereafter to be made in Palestine, we can only repeat that so very shadowy a structure must be proved to rest upon a most solid basis before we can regard it as more than a fleeting and evanescent cloud.¹

3. And, thirdly, we would fain inquire, with Hengstenberg, what is the value of a miserable life in Canaan (and the Jews there do, as a class, lead *most* miserable lives²) unless accompanied with special spiritual blessings? How can such an existence, as he justly asks, fulfil those promises, so rich, so glorious in their nature? Or how can it present hope for the future? This last query will receive a fuller reply, when we come to look, in our next section, at the general sentiments of Hengstenberg.

We must now glance briefly at a few counter-facts, if we may so call them. It must be frankly granted, that they are not weighty enough to stand as *proofs* of the correctness of our views. But as a key is probably the right one, which unlocks all the wards, however numerous and complicate, so *that* theory is probably true which does not hamper the array of facts with which it is concerned. We will mention some things, which either serve to indicate the mind of Christendom at certain periods, or which in other ways may serve as hints towards the formation of a just judgment. Of course, there is danger of our only selecting such facts as suit the positions here maintained. If, however, we unintentionally fall into this error, the critical reader will easily detect it.

(a.) How slow even Apostles proved at grasping the great truth, that the Gentiles were to become their fellow-heirs, is abundantly proved by the Book of Acts. How bitterly the unconverted Jews resented the bare idea of such a fellowship

¹ *Vide* Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, vol. x. (seventh edit.) The statutes are given, in epitome at least, by Milman. They are almost entirely political.

² Lists of subscription for their needs have recently appeared in the columns of the daily newspapers.

is displayed in the same sacred record, and even in the Holy Gospels.¹ But did our blessed Lord himself, did his Apostles, ever hold out any hopes that the captivity predicted by Him would, in a temporal sense, have any termination? Do the best commentators of any Christian community understand the fulfilment of 'the times of the Gentiles' (S. Luke xxi. 24) as prior to the general consummation? And is it not notorious to every student that we can not reason from the force of the word '*until*' in Scripture, as we might in writings originally composed in our own tongue? We shall most likely have occasion to recur to this point subsequently.

(β.) That strong antipathy between Jew and Christian, portrayed in Holy Writ, continued with unabated force for many centuries. (How far the milder feeling now prevalent may arise from any larger sense of true tolerance and charity, and how far from indifferentism and union in commercial pursuits, One alone can know, human motives being of so mixed a character.) We find S. Chrysostom, in his orations against the Jews,² urging Christians rather to endure sickness than send for a Jewish physician, though it is right to add that this injunction arose mainly from the belief that these doctors used charms and incantations to effect a cure. On the other hand, the Jews vexed, harassed, and (where they dared) persecuted the infant Church, in every conceivable way. We need not indeed adopt the severe language of Gibbon, and call the Jews 'enemies of the human race;' for the mind of Gibbon, as Milman justly observes, retained every vulgar prejudice against the race, whether regarded simply as Jews, or as the spiritual forefathers of Christians. But their *animus* against the Church is shown by countless deeds. How significant is that account of Jerome, (of which Dean Prideaux in his famous work reminds us), unable even to get a lesson in Hebrew except by stealth, and with the aid of heavy bribes. How remarkable the circumstance pointed out by Milman, that 'whenever occasion offered 'the Jews sided with the Arian faction, while the Arians were 'in general more tolerant towards the worshippers of the undivided unity of God than the Catholic Church.' Yes! for between the Jew and the heretic, the unbeliever in Christ and the impugner of his perfect Godhead, there lay a common bond—the hatred of the truth, and the wish to overthrow it. Here was the true *idem velle ac nolle*: here was there exhibited that

¹ Compare Acts xiii. 44—50, and xxii. 21—23, with S. Luke iv. 25—29; and see on this last passage the admirable '*Plain Commentary*' published by Parker (Oxford).

² The passages are given by Suicer. (Thesaurus sub voce 'Ιουδαίος.)

³ Our references to Milman always mean the third vol. of his '*History of the Jews*.'

instinct of impiety, than which, it has most truly been asserted, nothing can be more infallible.¹ And when, at an earlier period, that Jewish revolt under Adrian had failed; when the son of a star, Barchochēbas,² was called by his deluded countrymen Barcosba, the son of a Lie; when the very name of the Holy City was abolished for a new title (composed of the Emperor's *prænomen* and an epithet of the Roman Jupiter), *Ælia Capitolina*; in what terms do Christian writers speak of the simultaneous edict which forbade any Jew to enter the capital of his native land?

Eusebius and Tertullian, S. Justin, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Jerome, S. Hilary, and S. Chrysostom, have all alluded to this remarkable law.³ *But not one among them hints at any hope of a national restoration in store for Israel*, and some have expressed their conviction that such an event was never destined to take place. We submit that even silence is, in such cases, full of meaning. The Church, in that age, acknowledged no such interpretation of prophecy.

(γ.) In connexion with this heathen appellation of Jerusalem, Eusebius records a scene of very singular character. During the persecution of Diocletian, which commenced in A.D. 305, five Egyptians were apprehended as Christians. They had adopted, instead of their birth-names, those of ancient prophets, Elijah, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Samuel, and Daniel, that they might, says the historian, 'display the inward Jew and genuine Israel of God not only in their deeds, but in their very names.' The judge demanded of one that he should specify his country. He answered, in harmony, adds Eusebius, with his name, 'that Jerusalem was his country, meaning *that*, of which it has been said by Paul, Jerusalem which is above, &c.' (Gal. iv. 26 and Heb. xii. 22 are quoted.) The judge, perplexed by the reply, tortured the Egyptian, in order to discover the position of this city, conceiving that the Christians were about to erect some town that should be hostile and troublesome to the Romans. The sufferer still maintained the truth of his assertion, merely adding 'that it was a country of God's worshippers alone (τῶν θεοσεβῶν, as opposed to idolaters), and that it lay towards the east and the rising sun.' He and his brethren all won the crown of martyrdom.⁴

¹ 'Rien n'est plus infallible que l'instinct de l'impiété.'—De Maistre.

² Βαρχοχέβας ὄνομα (δοτέρα δηλοῖ τοῦτο.) Euseb. H. E. iv. 6.

³ The authorities have been collected by Valesius in a valuable note to Euseb. H. E. lib. iv. cap. 6; and again, with slight variety, by Dr. Münter, cited by Rev. G. Williams (Holy City, vol. i. p. 213). Neither has mentioned S. Chrys. Orat. V. cont. Jud., or S. Hilary in Psal. lviii.

⁴ Euseb. de Martyribus Palestinæ. (H. E. tom. ii. pp. 626, 627, ed. Burton, Oxon., A.D. 1838.)

Now what are the natural conclusions from this history? We gladly adopt the comment of one, who (perhaps alone among living writers of weight and authority) seems rather inclined to espouse a view of prophecy contrary to ours.

'The narrative is instructive as demonstrating, first, how entirely the very memorial of the ancient name of *Ælia* had perished, when it was so strange to the Roman procurator of Palestine, that he thought it must be a city which the Christians were erecting in defiance of the government; and secondly, as *proving how fully the Christian's mind was imbued with the persuasion that the earthly type had been superseded by the heavenly reality.*'

May we not, then, claim some countenance to our cause from the ranks of 'the noble army of Martyrs?'

(8.) The revolvers under Adrian had hoped to rebuild the temple. A similar movement under Constantine aimed at like objects, and failed in the same manner. But a third attempt, with the sanction and aid of the apostolic Julian, was likewise made. This too was frustrated, *and how? By the special and miraculous interposition of God Himself.* Of all miracles, saving and excepting those recorded by inspired penmen, there is not one, perhaps, so well attested and confirmed as this. The leading facts have received not merely the witness of Christian preachers and historians, but the unsuspecting testimony of the heathen annalist, Ammianus Marcellinus. Warburton, by no means a man of credulous disposition, has established its truth in a most copious and cogent dissertation. We remember to have heard a professor in an English university declare that the rejection of this miracle seemed to involve an unwarrantable degree of scepticism; and even Gibbon writes concerning it, as one perplexed what to advance. Yet, if the miraculous nature of this interference be once admitted, does it not best harmonize with the opinions of those who do *not* look for any resuscitation of the earthly stock of Abraham as a nation? So, at least, thought a great and saintly prelate of that generation, whose words will be cited subsequently in the latter portion of our critique.

(9.) The theology of the Middle Ages, dogmatic rather than exegetical, meddled but little apparently with such questions as the one before us. Anselm never once refers to them. In the famous *Summa Theologiæ* of Aquinas, scarcely any notice is taken of the Jews of that age, excepting in connexion with the startling doctrine that the faithful have dominion over the goods of these unbelievers. The great poem of Dante is equally silent respecting them. But, however contemptuous the silence, however tremendous *their* state of servitude (and the picture in Scott's *Ivanhoe* seems but too well founded), the highest

¹ Rev. G. Williams. Holy City, vol. i. p. 233.

authority was frequently exerted in their favour. S. Hilary of Poitiers has already been mentioned as their benefactor. And in medieval times, 'of all European Sovereigns, the popes, with some exceptions, pursued the most humane policy towards the Jews.' But neither S. Hilary nor any pope (so far as we are aware) ever held out to them any prospect of a return to Palestine. There was, indeed, a mighty movement in those days for the recovery of the Holy Land, but most assuredly it was not made on behalf of its former possessors. Is there one single hint to such effect in any document connected with the Crusades? We have never seen nor heard of such. Our appeal to those expeditions need not include any question of their merits. The reader may, with the sceptic Hume, regard them as 'the most durable monument of human folly;' with Dr. Arnold and Sir Francis Palgrave, condemn them as utterly anti-Christian; with Professor Smyth palliate them; with Bishop Heber, almost defend them. In any case he must admit them as a great fact, and they certainly tend to show that the notions we are engaged in combating could hardly have existed then. The Crusaders fearfully maltreated the Jews; but the barbarity thus exhibited towards that devoted race was not sanctioned by the medieval Church. Pope Eugenius the Third did all in his power to repress it.

Pope Eugenius had a friend, in all but station, far greater than himself. Did we wish to make the most of the authority of the holy Abbot of Clairvaux, we would quote that glowing apostrophe to Jerusalem in his address to the Knights Templars, which glides so naturally and easily from the earthly to the spiritual city. But the following letter is more curious, and surely must have sufficed to place S. Bernard in the preceding section, had we not preferred to reserve his observations for this place:—

'For the rest, brethren, I warn you, yet not I, but the Apostle of God with me, that ye "*believe not every spirit.*" We have heard, and with joy, that the zeal of God glows within you; but it thoroughly needs to be combined with the tempering restraint of knowledge. *The Jews are not to be persecuted, they are not to be slain, they are not even to be chased away.* Ask them [the persecutors] for Holy Writ. I know what is read in the Psalm, as prophesied of the Jews. "*God sheweth me,*" saith the Church, "*of mine enemies, slay them not, lest my people forget it.*" They are to us as living monuments, showing forth the Passion of the Lord. Therefore have they been scattered into all lands, that while they undergo the just punishment of so heinous a crime, they may be the witnesses of our redemption. And hence, in the same Psalm, the Church further saith, "*scatter them by thy*

¹ Milman, vol. iii. p. 300. His pages, and those of Gibbon, are our authorities for what immediately follows. Why a distinguished orator in the House of Commons lately contradicted Milman's account of the Papal behaviour, we do not understand.

power and put them down, O Lord, our defence." And thus hath it come to pass; they are scattered, they are put down; they endure a hard captivity under Christian princes. "*Yet shall they be converted at eventide,*" and in season shall regard be had to them. Lastly, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in, "*then,*" saith the Apostle, "*all Israel shall be saved.*" Meanwhile, indeed, he that dieth, abideth in death.¹

Here we observe the same features—firm hopes of Jewish spiritual conversion; no thought of Jewish temporal restoration. In connexion with S. Bernard's defence of the Jews, and hopes concerning them, there has occurred in our own age a circumstance of touching interest. Two biographies of that devoted servant of God have lately been given to the world, each the production of eminent men, one a Protestant, one a Roman Catholic. The authors were the historian Neander and M. Ratisbonne; *both converts to Christianity from Judaism.*²

(ζ) The Reformation did not, we think, greatly change the feelings of any classes of Christians towards the Jews. Indirect benefits they doubtless gained in time from the growing spirit of general toleration; but, so far as theology is concerned, the views of the chief Reformers seem to have been even more severe, if possible, towards the Jews, and more hopeless of their spiritual amelioration than those of the unreformed communions.

(η.) A glance at the Israelites themselves, if it does not tend to confirm our views, will at least show nothing to annul or weaken them. The lineal descendants of Abraham have generally adopted one of four lines of conduct. 1. They have been among those who are devoted to the pursuit of wealth, and care but little for the law of Moses or the valleys of Canaan;

'With dumb despair their country's wrongs behold,
And dead to glory, only burn for gold.'

How the higher and more successful votaries have influenced European politics, and won, at least, an *outward* deference from

¹ 'De cetero, fratres, moneo vos, non autem ego, sed Apostolus Dei mecum, non esse credendum omni spiritui. Audivimus et gaudemus, ut in vobis ferveat zelus Dei: sed oportet omnino temperamentum scientiæ non deesse. Non sunt persequendi Judæi, non sunt trucidandi, sed nec effigandi quidem. Interrogate eos divinas paginas. Novi quid in Psalmo legitur prophetatum de Judæis: *Deus ostendit mihi, inquit Ecclesia, super inimicos meos: ne occidas eos, nequando obliviscantur populi mei.* Vixi quidam apices nobis sunt, representantes Dominicam passionem. Propter hoc dispersi sunt in omnes regiones, ut dum justas tanti facinoris pœnas luant, testes sint nostræ redemptionis. Unde et addit in eodem Psalmo loquens Ecclesia: '*Disperge illos in virtute tua, et depone eos, protector meus Domine.*' Ita factum est: dispersi sunt, depositi sunt; duram sustinent captivitatem sub principibus Christianis. '*Convertentur tamen ad vesperam,*' et in tempore erit respectus eorum. Denique cum introierit gentium multitudo, '*tunc omnis Israel salvus erit,*' ait Apostolus. Interim sane qui moritur, manet in morte.'—Epist. cccxiii. (Tom i. p. 328, Ed. Mabillon, A.D. 1690.)

² We must thank a friend for pointing out to us this incident.

Christian merchants, kings, and statesmen; how 'the filthy habits, the base frauds, and the miserable chicanery of many of their lower orders,'¹ have chilled the feelings of those who would fain take interest in them; *this* is not the place to recount; both phases are indelibly stamped upon the page of history and daily experience. Clearly these are not the men of whom it is possible to expect any great things either in a religious or temporal point of view. They would not, as a class, undergo any great sacrifices to regain the land of their forefathers, far less for the attainment of blessings which are purely spiritual.

2. But another set of Jews did worse. In Spain many pretended to be Christians, and rose to high offices in Church and State, retaining in secret the creed of Judaism alone. The end of that fearful hypocrisy is written, too, in history, and upon one of its most terrible and blood-stained pages.² Yet, shocking and wholly indefensible as was the mode of trial then prevalent throughout Europe, and pushed to its furthest extent in the proceedings of the Spanish Inquisition, the wickedness of this covert Judaism, the life of blasphemous deceit it must have entailed on its professors, is not therefore palliated or left unimproved. It is a strange proof that genius and clearness of vision may be utterly dimmed by preconceived theories and national prejudice, that this life of falsehood has been proclaimed in the ablest political novel of our day, without one sentence or syllable of reprobation. But such Jews could never, in their inmost hearts, be hoping for the blessings either of earth or heaven.

3. A third class there is, who must certainly deserve the attachment of those Christians who expect to see Israel, as a nation, again in Israel—a class to which we are very far from refusing a large measure of respect and sympathy. We mean the patriots among the Jews—Talmudists, poets, pilgrims to Jerusalem. It speaks indeed but little for the value of Rabbinical studies, that so few have been led by them to Him 'of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write;' it is sad to read of a most learned Rabbi, Akiba, throwing his lot with the impostor, Barchochēbas. But these were not (speaking generally) either sordid or deceitful sons of Israel. They toiled and thought, they dared and suffered. Such an one, at the commencement of the twelfth century, was Jehuda Ben Halēvy, a learned Talmudist, an earnest patriot, a fervid

¹ Milman.

² Mr. Prescott's 'Ferdinand and Isabella' will be found to give ample information on this head.

poet, whose strains, we believe, are yet sung by his brethren on the anniversary of the burning of the temple:—

‘ May my tongue be parch’d and cleave
Fast to my mouth’s roof; and wither
This right hand, should I forget
Ever thee Jerusalem!

Words and air, incessantly
Ring they in my head to-day;
And I hear a sound of voices,
Manly voices, chanting psalms.

Oft-times flitting come before me,
Beards, those long and shadowy beards—
Dreamy phantoms, which among ye
Is Jehuda Ben Halévy?

But they hurry swiftly past;
Spectres timorously shun
Our rude converse here on earth—
Still, I recognised his face.

I knew him by the pale expanse
Of clear and lofty-thoughted brow,
By the firm gaze of those sweet eyes,
That look’d so sadly questioning.

But, chief of all, I recognised
The mystic and peculiar smile,
(Made by the fine half-parted lip)
Which none, save poets only, wear.

Years come forth and quickly vanish.
There have past now since the birth
Of Jehuda Ben Halévy,
Seven hundred and fifty years.

First did he behold the daylight
At Toledo in Castile,
And for him the golden Tagus
Murmur’d sweet his cradle song.’

Such is the wild and beautiful opening of a poem upon Jehuda which a German, himself of Hebrew parentage, has lately given to the world.¹ But, alas for Jehuda! that his journeyings did not bring him to the true Jerusalem: and doubly alas for this bard who glorifies his memory! for Heinrich Heine believes, we fear, neither in Christ, nor even (Judaically) in Moses. We cannot recommend the study of Heine’s writings, any more than one can recommend the study of our countryman Shelley. Yet Shelley has his blameless pieces; and some of these (as his ode to the skylark) have evidently been read, and even imitated, by writers of sacred

¹ Romanzero, von Heinrich Heine. Hamburg, A.D. 1852. We are sadly conscious of the loss in diction and music of rhythm inflicted upon Heine’s verses by our translation.

poetry. And thus, too, in the lay before us, Heine has almost entirely laid aside that *esprit malin et moqueur* with which a French critic has justly charged him, and which an English translator, Mr. Akerlos, has done his best to make known by selecting the most offensive poem in the *Romanzero*, and prefixing to it a preface, if possible, more objectionable still. But if the composition called *Disputation* be even worse than anything in *Queen Mab*, it may yet be excusable to look for a moment upon Heine's portrait of one of his own race; and we therefore give, as indirectly bearing upon our subject, one more sample—these picturesque descriptions of an earnest Hebrew, and his feelings towards Jerusalem below. After a long account of the young student's mental progress, he is compared, as a minstrel, to the Troubadours. Like them, Jehuda had an object of affection, but not, says the poet, a Laura, nor a Châtelaine presiding over tilt and tourney:—

' She, the loved one of the Rabbi,
Was a poor and mournful choice,
Ruin's melancholy image,
And her name—Jerusalem.

Even in early childhood's day
Was she his entire love;
Made his very heart to tremble
Even the word—Jerusalem.

Purple glowing on his cheeks,
Rose the youth, and listening stood,
When a pilgrim to Toledo
Came from the far Morning-Land;

And told his tale; how desolate,
How polluted now the spots,
Where of prophet's footsteps yet
Shone on earth the luminous track.

Where the air yet breathed of balsam,
From the eternal breath of God.
Oh! the woful aspect!

• • • •

She, the crowded holy city,
Hath a wilderness become;
Where the satyr, wolf, and jackal
All their wild existence urge.

Serpents, birds of night, are nestling
By the weather-beaten walls;
From a window's airy arches
Gazes, with delight, the fox.

Here and there break forth at moments
Ragged ones, the Desert's sons,
Who, their high-back'd camels leading,
Feed them mid the long-grown grass.

On the noble height of Zion,
Where the golden firmament
By its glories erst bare witness
To Jehovah's pomp on high.

There, with weeds entwined and tangled,
Prostrate lie the ruins grey;
Ruins to our gaze so mournful,
That one must believe they weep.

And, in sooth, they seem as weeping
Once a year, upon *that* day,
Ninth day of the month called Ab:
Yea! myself, with weeping eyes,

Saw amaz'd the thick drops trickling
From the massive stones around;
While the broken Temple pillars,
Sent abroad a wailing sound.'

Such are supposed to have been the pictures (in themselves as truthful as they are full of pathos) which drew Jehuda ben Halevy to Jerusalem, where he perished by the lance of a Saracen. Certainly, such words, if any, might move one to sympathy with the Israelites, who still yearn, like Jehuda, to win back those terrestrial homes; but, before we indulge in any further comment, let us listen to an authentic description of the *present* condition of such as follow in his footsteps. Thus speaks concerning them Dr. Macgowan, an English physician of some eminence, who accompanied the late Bishop Alexander to Jerusalem:—

'The most prominent trait in their character is a devoted attachment to the land of their fathers, and especially to the holy city of Jerusalem. This, however, is combined with many peculiar notions of a superstitious nature, which excite mingled feelings of compassion and respect. To live and die in this sacred spot, is, in their opinion, attended with extraordinary privileges, both temporal and spiritual. Released from the cares and business and tumult of the world, their lives are to be exempt in a greater degree from the common infirmities of human nature, and spent in an uninterrupted enjoyment of peaceful, calm, and holy meditation. Their prayers are to ascend with more fervent rapture to the throne of the Most High; their nights are to be favoured with celestial visions, and communion with angelic beings; and, finally, at the close of their mortal life, their souls shall be at once received into eternal glory. Such are the exaggerated privileges of the Jewish inhabitants in the Holy City, the anticipation of which annually attracts vast numbers from all parts of the world to its walls. But, with the majority, these high-wrought expectations are soon followed by disappointment. The novelty of the scenes and places connected with religious association soon dies away, and is succeeded by the aspect of their real desolation. The wretchedness of their dwellings, the *scarcity and dearth of provisions, the sickliness of the climate*, the want of all occupation, except the study of the Talmud, and the cold lifeless round of formal devotions—these, and many other circumstances, of which impoverished means are too often an accompaniment—damp the spirits of the new comer, and chill his enthusiasm. His disappointment is

deep, as his hopes had been elevated, and ends in a state of mind bordering on despair, or, more commonly, in listless apathy. Their persons, their dress, and houses, all bear a neglected air; their means become exhausted, their health fails, and they die, leaving their families supported by a pittance from the synagogue. There are numbers of widows and orphans in Jerusalem who have thus lost their husbands and parents, and whose peculiar history and destitution render them objects of more than ordinary interest. Neglect, poverty, and disease, are their portion, with an utter want of religious instruction.¹

We have given both the poetry and the prose of the case, and are therefore in a position to take a *conspectus*, as it were, of the whole. On the one hand, it must be acknowledged that the condition of Palestine and Jerusalem, and the Jewish race, is a spectacle full of woe and sadness; and that the hopes of a national restoration of that unhappy people appeal to many of our deepest and most natural instincts, our own love of home, our notions of the *prestige* derived from previous long possession, our very spirit of patriotism itself. But, on the other hand, let it be well considered, that a Jewish possession of Canaan must involve many miraculous interpositions; not merely interference with the political conditions of other nations, (which happen in every age,) but positive renewal of the country's climate and immense enlargement of its capacity for the sustenance of human life. But all this is promised, say our opponents. Ah! that is the very question at issue between us. We have given *some* reasons, and shall proceed to give *more*, for thinking that it is *not* promised. Even a restoration of Jerusalem, if it were to take place, *need* not include a return of the Jews to the Holy Land. If their possession were of long duration, their exclusion has already lasted longer. The Canaanites lost the land for ever by reason of their iniquities; why may not the Jews, too, have lost it finally, seeing that they have sinned yet more fearfully and against greater light? There is no greater difficulty in their suffering for the sins of their forefathers until the consummation of all things, than there is in the entire human race undergoing the penalty of Adam's sin until that same most blessed regeneration be accomplished. Doubtless, God can, if it please Him, do all, and abundantly more than all, that is required for the temporal restoration of His ancient people. But it is not—with reverence be it said—it is not at all in accordance with the analogy of His general dealings, *that He should simply do again what has once been undone*. Penitence can never be like innocence: our first parents never regained

¹ We are indebted for this extract to a publication which takes a view of prophecy opposite to that maintained by us. Dr. Macgowan seems to have displayed a most praiseworthy and touching solicitude both for the bodies and souls of these poor creatures.

the earthly Paradise from which they were expelled. And if our interpretation of prophecy seem to any to be a cold and hard-hearted one, such students of Holy Scripture will, we are sure, be ready to admit that the primary question is, whether it be *true*. If it be well-founded and correct, we may safely leave the rest in the hands of Him by whose Spirit the prophets spake. And, on this point, even a book of the Apocrypha may perhaps read us a moral lesson. When the pseudo-Esdras, writing probably in the second century of the Christian era, lamented over 'the travail of Jacob and the wearisome toil of 'the stock of Israel'—when he grieved that 'this one people,' if it must be punished, should be suffering at the hands of the heathen, rather than from *direct* judgments of God Himself—then 'the angel,' he writes, 'that came to me the night afore 'was sent to me, and said unto me, Hear me, and I will instruct 'thee; hearken to the thing that I say, and I shall tell thee 'more. And I said, Speak on, my Lord. Then said he unto 'me, *Thou art sore troubled in mind for Israel's sake: lovest thou 'that people better than He that made them?*'¹

No: *if* these views be based upon God's truth, they must be the wisest, must be the most just, must be at the same time the most merciful. If we are not disposed to look forward to a Jewish repossession of the Holy Land, it is because we have learnt to anticipate for them a far higher and more glorious destiny. It is often thus with individual souls; though the repentant be not as the innocent, yet can God, of his great mercy, overrule to good past evil, and grant to fervid penitence a place in His kingdom higher than that accorded to a less active innocence. It is thus with mankind at large; though neither Adam nor their descendants can win back again the garden of Eden, yet shall the bliss of the redeemed in Heaven above be greater and more precious far than could ever have been the lot of the first pair in their home on earth. And thus, too, with reference to the lineal sons of Abraham. If we are not disposed to anticipate for them a national re-erection and return to Canaan, it is partly because we do firmly believe that there are in store for them more glorious things than these. To own the great crime of which they inherit the miserable results; to repent of it, and be again at peace with God and in His favour; to be once more the vanguard of the armies of the Lord of Hosts against the adversaries of His righteous will; to shew forth the truth of the Divine promises in the full sight of the Church and of the world—a consolation to the one, a warning to the other—these are blessings nobler, grander, more

¹ 2 Esdras, v. 28—33, 35.

exalted far, than the possession of a few square miles of territory, even though its associations be justly dear and hallowed, even though it should be restored to fruitfulness, and flow, as of old, with milk and honey.

We must shortly proceed to examine the writings of those great men, who are masters in that school of prophetic interpretation wherein we are only humble pupils. But before we conclude this division of our subject, it is only reasonable to turn for a moment to the disciples of the schools opposed to ours, and demand to whom *they* make appeal as *their* authorities in the questions now before us. If we be unable to reply on their behalf, we can at least mention some names of weight, to whom, we believe, they cannot or do not look for countenance. They cannot appeal to the Ante-Nicene Fathers of the Church, for even the Chiliasts among these have been fully shewn, we trust, to hold a different doctrine; they cannot appeal to the great doctors of the fourth and fifth centuries, for these, when they do not contradict, at any rate ignore the idea of a Jewish return to Palestine; they cannot appeal to the honoured names of the middle ages—a Bernard, an Anselm, an Aquinas; they do not produce one favourable sentence from the works of the leading Reformers, whether English or continental; and among the most valuable commentaries upon Holy Scripture, Papal or Protestant, which have been published since the epoch of the Reformation, most scanty (if we err not) is the list of such supporters as can be accounted of any real and solid weight.

It is to be found in the ‘Dissertations’ of Bishop Newton, who fixes the return of the Jews for the time when the Turks fall, and Antichrist is destroyed.¹ The presence, however, of the theory in Bp. Newton’s book is almost tantamount to a proof that it is *prior* to his time, since no one ever accused that writer of having produced an original idea. Some readers may possibly recollect the sentiments of Newton’s contemporary, Dr. Johnson, upon this point. We must own that we have never been able to dissociate them from the work since Dr. S. R. Maitland, in one of his really valuable tracts upon Prophecy, rather cruelly reminded us of their existence. For the benefit of those who may not be able to call them to mind, they shall here be given in a foot-note.²

But Newton refers us to a much greater man, the true

¹ Vol. iii. p. 407. Ed. Lond. 1766.

² Dr. Adams. ‘I believe his “Dissertations on the Prophecies” is his great work.’ Johnson. ‘Why, Sir, it is *Tom’s* great work; but how far it is great, or how much of it is *Tom’s*, are other questions; I fancy a considerable part of it was borrowed.’—Croker’s Boswell’s Johnson, vol. v. p. 185. Johnson had been provoked by Newton, and thought meanly of his character: but it does not follow that his characterisation of the work is incorrect.

antistes of this school of prophecy—‘the pious and profoundly learned’ Joseph Mede. The great merits of Mede, and the consequent injury that he has done towards the proper study of prophecy in this land, perpetually remind us of the somewhat hackneyed line in Addison’s *Cato*:—

‘Curse on his virtues: they’ve undone his country.’

But we are learning to gaze upon the mischief with more equanimity in consequence of our deep conviction, that not even the name of Mede can long resist, in the judgment of real theologians, the continuous blows which are now assailing his authority, as a guide in prophetic interpretation. There has been published, in the first place, that most weighty *Concio* of Bishop Pearson, recovered by the watchful care of Archdeacon Churton, who has fortified the case against Mede by recording in his preface the opinions of Dr. Burton and Bishop Horsley.¹ From American Protestantism has come a book by Moses Stuart, in the same direction. Germany sends the most reverent and non-rationalistic of her interpreters of prophecy, Hengstenberg. Among British Nonconformists, an apparently able reasoner, Mr. Bonar, follows on the same side.² In the English Church may be mentioned, with special honour, Dr. S. R. Maitland and Dr. Todd, whose arguments made Bp. Copleston pause and refrain from publishing in support of the views of Mede. The list might easily be enlarged; but at present we will only say that, in such company, we are content to decline acceptance of Mede’s system without entering into speciality of detail.

But can those who differ from us name any earlier or greater authority than this single one of Mede? ‘I look back,’ said the late excellent Mr. Bickersteth, in an address delivered at Bath in A. D. 1841, ‘to the *old* expositors of 200 years since—Brightman, ‘Mede, Tillinghast, and Durham.’ ‘These all agree,’ he adds, ‘in connecting the fate of the Turkish Empire with the restoration of the Jews.’ But is there one of them, excepting Mede, whose writings now possess the slightest influence upon the mind of Christendom?

There are indeed some sober expositors, who go so far as to adopt the view given by Hammond in his Paraphrase upon S. Luke xvi. 24, that ‘Jerusalem shall again be inhabited by ‘Jewish, as well as Gentile, Christians.’ But this expectation, however doubtful, is more like the tone of S. Justin Martyr and S. Irenæus, than that of our modern English school.

¹ *Concio* IV. ad Clerum. Pearson’s *Minor Works*, vol. ii. p. 44. Bp. Horsley, *British Magazine*, No. xxxiv. p. 73. Dr. Burton, Bampton Lectures, note 60, p. 436.

² Bonar on the Development of Antichrist.—Partridge & Co. For Hengstenberg and Stuart, see *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxvi. p. 383.

Meanwhile, therefore, until the contrary be distinctly proved, *we must venture to regard the belief in a return of Israel to Canaan as a Judaic notion; which has, during the last two centuries, been trying, as it were, to creep into the Church; and which will be compelled, on further examination, to retire again to the Synagogue whence it sprung.*

4. We mentioned four leading classes of Jews. Our final category was not intended to consist of those who, in the provinces of musical art, philosophy, or literature, had won fame and influence in the world. Such Israelites, however they may have proved that genius is not extinct in their race, would hardly, even if considered as a distinct class, have much connexion with our present subject. But we were thinking of those descendants of Abraham who had from time to time bowed down before the uplifted Cross. Even here there may often have rested—there must often still rest—the sad shade of suspicious motives. But dishonest conversions, though miserable for the pretenders themselves, have often benefited others. The children of the hypocrite may prove ‘Israelites indeed, in whom there is no guile.’ And even since the cessation of the extraordinary Pentecostal gifts, the Almighty has ever suffered some of His ancient people to be converted here and there, and now and then, one may trust as a pledge and earnest of the brighter day in store, the larger in-gathering yet to come. Such, for example, were those Israelites in Crete, of whose singular conversion (after experience of the delusions of a false prophet) the historian Socrates has given us an account.¹ Such, we will hope, were those for whom our English Henry III. erected a house of maintenance between the old and the new Temple in the metropolis.² Such, too, the multitudes, whom a holy Spaniard, S. Vincent Ferrer, is reported to have won over in the fifteenth century. Such, many single converts of great eminence, witnesses and examples to their brethren; as Nicolas de Lyra, a commentator of repute (and, if we err not, one of our school of *exegesis*); such, Jerome *de Sanctâ Fide*, a physician of name in Italy; such, Carettus and Emmanuel Tremellius. And, in this matter, we are glad to notice a thought of Mede’s, very modestly proposed by him in a letter to a friend.³ He suggests whether it may not be possible that the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who was by birth and education so completely an ‘Hebrew of the Hebrews,’ may prove to have been in his con-

¹ Socrates, *Hist. Ecclesiast.* lib. vii. cap. 38. Cf. Milman, vol. iii. p. 195.

² Camden’s *Britannia* and Stowe’s *Survey*, as cited by Fuller in his ‘*Pisgah-sight of Palestine*.’ (London, A. D. 1650.)

³ Mede, *Epistle* xiv.

version a type¹ of that national one which appears to be foretold. *He* had been a fierce persecutor of the Church of God, so have *they* been collectively. He was brought to the truth by a vision and a voice; may not some such blessed marvel be in store for them; and the declaration of the Saviour, that they should not see Him till they should say, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord,' receive in this way a most literal and complete fulfilment?

Oh great and blessed day, in whatsoever way it please God to vouchsafe to bring it about! Great masters of language have oftentimes kindled into eloquence as they described the sins and punishments of Israel; but who has written worthily—who *can* write worthily—of the blessedness of that thorough union of the walls of the great building in Him, who is the chief corner-stone?

IV. In appealing to the judgments of ancient writers upon prophecy, we have not intended to imply that their opinions upon its interpretation deserve the same respect as their enunciations on dogmatic theology. Concerning *dogmas*, they deliver not merely their own sentiments, but the general belief of the Church of their own times. 'This we hold, this we received, this is the faith once delivered to the saints and handed down to us'—such is their language concerning articles of the Creed; but on prophecy (with the exception, perhaps, of the brief list of subjects above cited from Augustine) they do not speak in the same manner. Interpretations are, in most cases, rather pious opinions than actual *credenda*: some clues to discovery are virtually admitted to have been lost: the wisest and most pious seem occasionally to agree to differ. Nevertheless, a continuous stream of consentient judgments upon one point, as *e.g.*, the ultimate *conversion* of the Jews, and an equally constant silence with respect to another point, as the *national restoration* of the race to Palestine, is a fact of no small importance. If a certain view claim to be of Christian birth, and is in reality Judaic in its origin; if it claim to have been anciently held in the Church and is in reality very recent; if it claim to be founded on the sure warrant of God's word, and is in reality based upon a mistaken system of interpretation; it is at least well that the matter should undergo some sifting and enquiry. Doubtless, a well-known passage in Bishop Butler's 'Analogy,'

¹ We have already mentioned the type of Joseph. Estius speaks of an ecclesiastical one, which, although connected with the Roman ritual, and not with that of our own Church, is too curious to be quite passed by. The priest commencing the office at the right of the altar, yet performs most at the left, and finally returns to the right. This practice Estius regards as a figure of the Gospel, commencing with the Jews, departing for most of the world's ages to the Gentiles, and then, ultimately, returning to the Jews again.

wherein that great philosophic divine speaks of new discoveries yet to be made in the pages of Holy Scripture, may most fitly be applied to the prophetic books of the Old and the New Testament. But then we have a right to see that the seekers be fitly qualified for their most sacred and responsible task. Are they, as a matter of fact, so qualified? Do the disciples of this modern school display such gifts of thought, of learning, of pious and reverent handling of their holy themes, as to command the respectful attention of the Christian Church? Let the utterly ephemeral character of the majority of their productions, let their entire lack of influence beyond the shores of Great Britain, be our reply. We turn to other lands and other men.

Between the sixth and the sixteenth centuries little seems to have been written upon the possibility of a national resuscitation of Israel. No man argues against opinions which are not seriously maintained amongst those whom he respects or thinks worth opposing: no children of the Church then cared, apparently, to confront ideas supposed to be only cherished in the prostrate and defeated synagogue. But in the earlier and later centuries the case stands differently. The more primitive Fathers come across the notion, either (as we have seen) in connexion with the question of the Millennium; or, again, in discourses against the Jews; or, thirdly, in apologies for the faith, wherein they point out to their heathen adversaries the wonderful confirmation of Christianity afforded by the condition of the race of Israel. The later writers touch upon it incidentally, as will be perceived when we come to mention them.

Some, in early ages, as Macarius the Egyptian, appear to speak almost despairingly of Judaism. Such writers¹ we shall not quote; for although none probably, except Cæsarius, have denied the expectation of ultimate conversion, yet their words *might* be considered by some to prove too much, and to point to more than a temporal overthrow. Our present appeal shall only be made to writers whose sentiments cannot possibly be mistaken.

We have named Tertullian as one of the supporters of the Millennium. It appears that he looked forward to spiritual joys only; but it has been seen that, in his treatise against Marcion, he represents his opponent as charging him with a

¹ See the translation of his 'Institutes of Christian Perfection,' by Mr. Granville Penn, b. v. c. 10. (Nisbet, London, A.D. 1828.) 'When they proceeded to such an extremity of wickedness as to feel no reverential awe for the Majesty of the Master himself, they were then, *once and for ever*, cast out and overthrown; and prophecy, priesthood, and worship, were taken away from them, and given to other nations which believed in Him.'—P. 118.

belief, not only that the Jews should, after death, enjoy in Hades refreshment in Abraham's bosom (*post decursum vitæ apud inferos in sinu Abrahæ refrigerium*); but likewise a restitution to their former country and condition (*pristinum statum ex restitutione terræ*). Let us listen to Tertullian's reply:—

'O exceeding goodness of God, if, when appeased, he restoreth that which he hath taken away in his wrath. O thy God, who both slayeth and maketh whole: ordereth evils and createth peace. O mercy of God that extendeth even unto Hades. Of Abraham's bosom we will speak at the proper time. *But concerning the restoration of Judæa (which the Jews also themselves hope for literally, led thereto by the mention of places and countries) how the allegorical interpretation suiteth spiritually to Christ and the Church, its constitution and its fruits, it were long to trace, and has already been discussed in another work, which we entitle 'De Spe Fidelium.'*'

And he proceeds to contrast with Jewish expectations his own belief in the reign of the thousand years, *after* the resurrection, in Jerusalem our mother above, brought down from heaven—the Jerusalem which Ezekiel knew and S. John beheld.* Nothing can be clearer than that Tertullian believed the Jews to have misunderstood the meaning of Holy Scripture, when they gathered from it the prospect of a literal re-possession of Canaan.

From the works of a Millenarian divine we turn to those of that great genius who first impugned, with success, the notion of an *actual* thousand years being the meaning of S. John in the Apocalypse. Let it be remembered, that agreement between those who are in some respects at variance, is always allowed to be a confirmation of the points agreed upon. Thus, in his famous treatise against the infidel Celsus, writes Origen on the theme before us:—

'One of the proofs, of Jesus having been something holy and divine, is the multitude and vastness of the ills that have now, on His account, for a long time befallen the Jews. *And we may confidently assert that they will never be restored.*'¹

¹ 'Deum optimum si reddit placatus quod et abstulerit iratus. O Deum tuum qui et cædit et sanat: condit mala et facit pacem. O Deum etiam ad inferos usque misericordem. Sed de sinu Abrahæ suo tempore. De restitutione verò Judææ, quam et ipsi Judæi, ita ut describitur, sperant, locorum et regionum nominibus inducti, quomodo allegorica interpretatio in Christum et in Ecclesiam, et habitum et fructum ejus spiritualiter competat, et longum est persequi et in alio opere digestum, quod inscribimus "*De Spe Fidelium*."—Tertull. cont. Marcionem, l. iii. c. 24, (p. 412, Ed. Wirceburgi, A. D. 1780.)

The '*De spe Fidelium*' is unfortunately lost.

² 'Nam et confitemur in terrâ nobis regnum repromissum sed ante cælum, *sed alio statu, utpote post resurrectionem* in mille annos, in civitate divini operis Jerusalem cælo delatâ; quam et Apostolus matrem nostram sursum designat. . . Hanc et Ezechiel novit et Apostolus Joannes vidit.'—Tertull. ibid.

³ ἐν οὖν τῶν παριστάτων θεῖόν τι καὶ ἱερὸν χρήμα γεγονέναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Ἰουδαίους ἐπ' αὐτῷ τοσαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα πόλλ' ἤδη συμβεβήκεναι χρόνῳ. Θαρρόμεν δ' ἐροῦμεν ὅτι οὐδ' ἀποκαταστήσονται.—Origenes cont. Cels. lib. iv. (tom. i. p. 516. Ed. Ben.)

Such language as this, whether used by Macarius or Origen, is not inconsistent with the hope of Jewish conversion, because such conversion does not involve any restoration of the ancient worship, priesthood, or national *status*. Other writers have shown what they meant by such terms; as, indeed, Origen may be well considered to do in the present instance, for he goes to assign more distinctly the death of the Saviour as the one cause of Jewish calamities, and declares that God's call to blessedness (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν μακαριότητα κλήσιν) has been transferred to another nation: 'I mean the Christians, to whom hath come the doctrine concerning genuine and pure religion; who have received new laws suited to their universal polity (τῇ πανταχοῦ καθεστώσῃ πολιτείᾳ), since those elder laws (inasmuch as they were given to a single nation governed by kings of its own race and habits) could not possibly be kept.'

It is, then, against the restoration, not the conversion of Israel, that such arguments were anciently directed. Yet the fear of being supposed to countenance Judaic views by the admission of a hopefulness concerning the end of the nation's life, seems to have caused some writers to speak in a more guarded manner than they would otherwise have done. This was specially the case with S. Jerome. That this great translator and critic of Holy Scripture *believed in the conversion of the Jews, and rejected the idea of their national resuscitation*, cannot be doubted by any who will take the trouble to compare the various passages in which he speaks of Jews and Judaism. If on either point S. Jerome appears to speak hesitatingly, such hesitation will be found to arise, on the one hand, from the fear already alluded to, lest he should be claimed as a partisan of Judaic interpretations of prophecy; on the other hand, lest, in opposing Millenarian views, his naturally impetuous temper might hurry him into disrespectful expressions towards the memory of the great and good men who had maintained them. From the list of notices of the subject in the works of Jerome, the following will, we believe, be found to be a perfectly fair, although brief, sample of his mode of treating it:—

'It must be observed, that this adulteress (Hosea iii. 1) sets forth the present condition of the Jews, who, though devoid of God and knowledge of the Scriptures, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, are yet beloved of the Lord, who looketh for the salvation of all men, and openeth the door to the repentant.'¹

'And since it were long at present to argue against the Judaic teaching and a blessedness that gratifies the Jewish palate and belly . . . let it

¹ 'Et notandum quod hæc adultera præsens tempus significet Judæorum, qui absque Deo et notitiâ Scripturarum et gratiâ Spiritûs sancti diligantur à domino; qui omnium expectat salutem et aperit januam pœnitentibus.'—S. Hieron. in Osee, c. iii. (tom. vi. p. 15. Ed. Basileæ, A. D. 1524.)

suffice to explain the matter briefly: *let us pass to the spiritual meaning, according to which we have explained also the latter portion of Isaiah.* For we do not, according to those Jewish fables which they call traditions (*δευτεράριαι*) look for a golden and jewelled Jerusalem from heaven, nor expect again to undergo the penalty of circumcision: nor to offer victims of bulls and rams, nor to sleep on the repose of the Sabbath day.¹

This outburst of feeling is followed by much detail, which deserves the attention of those who would thoroughly fathom the question. We can only find room for the following part of the commentary. (The chapter is Ezekiel xxxvii.)

‘But if that nation shall not have felt its sinfulness, but shall have polluted His holy name, then shall all, among whom they have dwelt, exclaim: “Behold the people of God, behold the people that departed, yea, rather was cast forth, out of his land.” But if they shall have repented, and I have been sanctified in the midst of them: then shall all the multitude of the Gentiles know, that I will take them from the lands whither they had been scattered, *and will bring them back into the land of the Church*, and will sprinkle over them not only the waters of saving baptism, but the waters likewise of doctrine and of the word of God, and I will cleanse them from all their defilements, and from all their idols and errors, which they had wrought within their hearts.’²

To students of Oriental tongues we submit the question, whether we may not claim on our side the authority of that sainted and most poetic doctor, S. Ephrem Syrus; whether, in modern times, the great Hebraist, Pocock, does not favour the same cause; whether we may not justly rank among the supporters of our view a name not unworthy to be joined with these—that of the present Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford.³ But we must not now linger upon debateable territory, and will, therefore, transport ourselves to Constantinople—the Constantinople of the fourth century, before Mahomet was born, or the Czar an European potentate.

¹ ‘Et quia longum est nunc adversum dogma Judaicum et beatitudinem ventri et gutturi Judaico servientem in brevi explanatione dicere: *ad spiritualem intelligentiam transeamus, juxta quam et Esaiæ extremas partes interpretati sumus.* Neque enim juxta Judaicas fabulas quas illi *δευτεράριαι* appellant, geminatam et auream de cœlo expectamus Hierusalem, nec rursus passuri circumcisionis injuriam: nec oblaturi taurorum et arietum victimas, nec sabbati otio dormiemus.’

² ‘Quod si nec senserit peccatum suum sed polluerit nomen sanctum ejus, dicent omnes inter quos habitaverit: Ecce populus Dei, ecce qui egressus est de terrâ ejus, immo projectus. Sin aut egerint poenitentiam et sanctificatus fuero in medio eorum: tunc omnis gentilium turba cognoscet quod ego eos tollam de terris in quas dispersi erant, *et reducam in terram ecclesiae*, et effundam super illos nequaquam aquas baptismi salutaris sed aquas doctrinæ et sermonis Dei, et mundabo illos ab universis inquinamentis suis, et ab universis idolis atque erroribus quæ in suo corde simulaverant.’—S. Hieron. in *Ezech.* cap. xxxvii. (tom. v. p. 509, Ed. Basil.) We submit to scholars that this version of the word *nequaquam*, however unclassical, gives the true meaning of S. Jerome.

³ S. Ephrem Syrus in *Esai.* v. sub fin. Pocock on *Hosea* iii. Dr. Pusey, note to *Oxf. Tr. of Tertullian*, p. 123.

Let us consider the opinions of S. Chrysostom. That great and eloquent Patriarch did not content himself with the simple expression of his conviction that Jerusalem would never be again restored to her place among the cities of the earth. His auditors had no mere *αὐτὸς ἔφη* to carry away with them; but a long, and, in some respects, even an intricate chain of argument. His reasonings will be found in that *Oratio adversus Judæos*, which the Benedictine editors have placed as *fifth* among the eight with the same title.¹ So great is its length, that the gifted preacher seems to have paid the penalty of, what is now termed, a clerical sore throat. What remedies he may have used, even Benedictine research has failed to discover; but hoarseness did not prevent him from giving his congregation a summary of this discourse on the very next day, which was a solemn one, kept in memory of the Martyrs.² Modern criticism has discovered flaws in a few points of these disquisitions. The chronology employed in part of the sixth discourse is now pronounced inaccurate. Grotius (as cited by Spencer, *ad Origen. c. Cels.*) raises strong doubts as to the justice of an appeal made to Josephus, who, in Chrysostom's judgment, despaired of the future national resuscitation of his countrymen. The quotations from the Jewish historian, although just as regards sense, are not given in the words of the writer. And the discussion on the prophecies of Daniel, and the captivity (as S. Chrysostom calls it) under Antiochus, may very possibly lie open to objections. Still, after making all reasonable deductions for these blemishes (which are due probably to the age at least as much as to the writer), there remains a mass of argument which is keen and forcible, and not easily to be gainsayed. We can only give a broken abstract.

In that flowing and copious Greek, which won for him his world-famed title, the archbishop invites the attention of his audience to the triumphs of the Divine Founder of Christianity, considered as a Legislator and a Prophet:—

'Others have tried to introduce dogmas, and to found a new polity, but all have failed. Witness Zeno, Plato, Socrates, Diagoras, Pythagoras, Apollonius of Tyana, and numbers more. (Not that one would compare the true Christ with these, save as a condescension to the weakness of the Jews, who regard him as mere man. Thus S. Paul deigned to argue from the altar at Athens, for the sake of those whom he was addressing.) Look at the failure of Theudas and Judas of Galilee, as set forth by their own Gamaliel. See the obedience paid to the laws of Christ not in one,

¹ The arrangement was a matter of no slight difficulty, and differs considerably from that of Savile and other previous editors.—Ed. Ben. tom. i. p. 583. *et seqq.*

² See the heading of the *sixth* discourse, which is about *half* the length of the preceding one. *Ἐπὶ τῇ κατασχέσει ἀπὸ τοῦ μήκους τῶν εἰρημένων.* Erasmus elegantly Latinizes: *cum prolixius disseruisset, atque hinc raucedinem vocis contraxisset, &c.* (Ed. Ben. tom. i. p. 649.)

nor ten, nor twenty homes, but in all parts of the world; an obedience frequently involving the greatest sacrifices, which are cheerfully suffered for His sake. Who, besides, ever availed to effect this? He foretold how that woman's pouring of the ointment should be named wheresoever his Gospel was preached; how his Church should spread; how wars should arise, and the temple be overthrown, the Jews led captive into all nations, and Jerusalem be trodden down of the Gentiles. If all the rest, as we see and know, has come to pass, why should the Jews expect a reversal of this last prediction? Let us turn to their own prophets. Can they show any announcement of a return from *this* captivity? They suffered aforetime a captivity in Egypt. Place, time, persons, limit of duration, were all foretold: God made them partly known even to Abraham (Gen. xv. 13; Cf. xlvii. 2—4, l. 25). They suffered aforetime a captivity in Babylon. But Jeremiah accurately defined it (Jer. xxix. 10), and Daniel understood this "Word of the Lord" (Dan. ix. 2). A third captivity, that under Antiochus Epiphanes, was predicted by Daniel himself, as also the liberation under the Maccabees (Dan. viii. and xi.). But where is the end of their present state of servitude announced? Do not the words of Daniel make against it (Dan. ix. 27; xii. 7, 8, 9)?¹ Does their own weightiest author, Josephus, (who admits that Daniel foretold the overthrow by the Romans,) dare to prophesy a restoration of Jerusalem? A right understanding of the 70 weeks of Daniel would lead men to the negative conclusion.

'If the Jews had never attempted to rebuild their temple, they might urge that they could do it, if it pleased them. But this pretext they have cut away for themselves. They have thrice made the attempt, and thrice been repulsed, as it might be in the Olympic games, so that the Church's crown of victory remains indisputable (*ὥστε ἀναμφισβήτητον εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸν στέφανον*). They tried it under Adrian, and the result was a more thorough overthrow than ever. The city lost her name, and became *Ælia*, after *Ælius* Adrianus. They tried it under Constantine, and were chased away; the captives having first lost their ears, and received the brand upon their persons. But this is old and obsolete. Not so; the seniors among them can remember it. But I come to a third attempt, one notorious even to the young; one which happened, not under Adrian nor Constantine, but under a monarch of our generation, some twenty years ago. Julian, of all emperors the most impious—it was to *this* wicked pagan that they did not blush to appeal for the restitution of their temple, their city, and their rites, and to invoke the aid of his impure hands to the construction of *holy* places. They perceived not that they were attempting the impossible; they bethought them not that if *man* had overthrown, *man* might have restored; but that human power could never reverse the divine decree. "For the Lord of Hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" Expense and toil were not spared; that mad and senseless one thought to frustrate the sentence of Christ. But He "taketh the wise in their own craftiness." The fire burst forth; even Jews were startled and abashed: even Julian feared to proceed further. Go even now to Jerusalem, and you may see the bare foundations; ask the reason, and you will be told none other than this. We are all witnesses of these things; and they occurred, not under pious emperors, lest any should say the Christians stopped the work, but *then*, when we were persecuted, when our very lives were in danger, when liberty of speech was denied, and heathenism was flourishing. *Then* did all this happen, that no shameless pretext might be

¹ Dan. ix. 27 is thus interpreted by Cornelius à Lapide: 'Jerusalem, cujus desolatio durabit usque in finem mundi.'

left to them.—No: it was not to be. Your prophets foretold the preaching of Christ's gospel, and the coming of another kind of sacrifice. If I quote those before the captivity, you will say that the ills they predicted came to pass *in* the captivity. Listen, then, to the latest, Malachi. He, when all was restored, foretold the abolition of your sacrifices; speaking in the person of the Almighty, he says, "Neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering. But ye have profaned it." This universality is fulfilled in Christ alone. The pure sacrifice is the Christian one, offered, not with smoke and savour, blood and trespass-offerings, but through the grace of the Holy Spirit. Harken how the Gospels and the Apostle agree with prophecy. The Apostle (Titus ii. 11) tells of the saving grace appearing unto all men. Christ informs the Samaritan woman of the worshipping, not on Gerizim nor at Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth (S. John iv. 21—23). Christians, bring back by every means in your power these sick ones to Christ, that both here and hereafter we may receive a reward, far surpassing our good deeds, by the grace and goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom and with whom be glory to the Father, together with the holy and life-giving Spirit, now and ever, world without end. Amen.

Such is a sketch (however feeble and imperfect) of the teaching which this glorious doctor of the Church repeats briefly in the following form:—

'To their present captivity no prophet has defined a limit of time. That these woes will have an end, and be in some way stayed, neither Daniel nor any other prophet has declared. Nay, he has even predicted the reverse, that this servitude shall hold them unto the consummation.'¹

A long gulf must now be leapt across. For reasons above stated, we must descend to very recent times. Yet, in passing, we may observe that the general tone of Luther's *exegesis* (so far as we are acquainted with it) appears far more consonant with the patristic interpretations of the words of Psalmist and Prophet than with either the Judaic or the modern (semi-Judaic) view. And as regards Calvin, it may be doubted whether he looked upon Judaism with any feelings of tenderness or of hope. Certainly, in commenting upon Romans xi. 26, he interprets the words 'all Israel' of the spiritual only, and not the lineal, progeny of Abraham. Some few ancient writers, Theodoret² for instance, agree with him in this comment; but it is decidedly at variance with the general *consensus*

¹ Τῇ παρούσῃ δὲ [δουλείᾳ sc.] οὐδεὶς ὥρισε χρόνον προφήτης.—ὅτι δὲ ἔξει τέλος καὶ στήσεται πον τὰ κακὰ ταῦτα, οὐτε ἐκεῖνος ἐδήλωσεν, οὐτε ἄλλος τις προφήτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦναντίον προείπεν, ὅτι ἔως συντελείας καθέξει αὐτοὺς ἡ δουλεία αὕτη. (S. Chrys. Orat. VI. adv. Jud.—Tom. i. pp. 650, 1. Ed. Ben.)

² Theodoret, however, looked for Jewish conversion. The present writer has not had the opportunity of examining Calvin's Commentary on Jeremiah and other parts of the *Old Testament* as he could wish; but the great logical consistency of the Genevese Reformer, (admitted even by Möhler and other adverse critics,) induces him to believe Calvin to have taught the same thing throughout.

patrum. If, as we are inclined to believe, Calvin was wholly adverse to any expectations of Jewish resuscitation, whether temporal or spiritual, his great influence would sufficiently account for that tone of Swiss theology to which allusion was made at the commencement of this article.

But our vault over some centuries will let us alight upon a name of European celebrity—no less an one than that of Blaise Pascal. Over and above the respect due to his *dicta* in general, we cannot but think that peculiar attention should be paid to his sentiments respecting the Jews, because Pascal had bestowed so much of his great powers of thought upon the fortunes of that unhappy race. Nowhere, perhaps, in a work of apology for Christianity, is so large a proportion of pages devoted to reflections upon the Jews, as in the famous '*Pensées*.' Pascal, too, believed that they would ultimately repent and accept the Gospel; but, as regards a national restoration, how completely he is a disciple of Origen and Chrysostom let the following extract suffice to prove:—

'The condition in which we see the Jews is, moreover, a great proof of Christianity. For it is an astonishing thing to see this people exist for so long a period, and to see it always miserable: it being requisite for the proof of Jesus Christ, both that they should exist to prove His truth, and also that they should be miserable, because they crucified Him; and although prolonged misery and existence are contradictories, they nevertheless continue to exist despite their misery.

'But were they not almost in the same condition at the time of the captivity? *No*. The sceptre was not at all interrupted by the captivity in Babylon, *because the return was promised and foretold*. When Nebuchadnezzar carried off the people, then, for fear lest they should imagine that the sceptre had departed from Judah, it was told them beforehand that they would be there but for a short time, and that they should be re-established. They were constantly consoled by their prophets, and their kings were continued. But the second destruction is without promise of re-establishment, without prophets, without kings, without consolation, without hope, because the sceptre had departed for ever. (*Mais la seconde destruction est sans promesse de rétablissement, sans prophètes, sans rois, sans consolation, sans espérance, parce que le sceptre est ôté pour jamais.*)

'That is hardly captivity which possesses the assurance of being delivered at the end of seventy years. But *now* they are without any hope.'

We must now mention a living writer. Who, among all the present race of German commentators upon Prophecy, would be selected by Englishmen as the most deserving of respect? We need not go to cloistered students for a reply. Even a debater in the British House of Commons can pronounce for us the name of Hengstenberg. Let us open, then, his *Christology of the Old Testament*.

¹ *Pensées de Pascal. Seconde Partie. Article xii. § iv.*

On Zechariah xi. 12, he speaks of the restoration of Israel to their ancient gracious relation to the Lord, as taught by plain declarations, both of the Old and New Testament. He expresses his conviction (as Mede and others have done) that the declaration of our Lord in S. Matthew xxiii. 39, is thus to be understood.¹ Just before he has observed:—

‘ In the second part of Isaiah the return from exile is so constantly regarded as a type of the future return of the heathen nations from the captivity of sin and error, that it is often difficult to decide what belongs to the type and what to the antitype,—so, also, the splendid deliverance of the people of God from their oppressors, through the Maccabees, typified their future last and great deliverance.’

The above extract will probably seem to mark with sufficient clearness the side espoused by this devout and instructive commentator; but he has elsewhere made remarks which are so valuable, as bearing on the general principles of prophetic interpretation, and so peculiarly applicable to the particular questions before us, that we cannot refrain from alluding to them, and (in part at least) setting them before our readers, many of whom may not have read them previously. Now it has been asserted by Bishop Horsley, that Calvin was a bad commentator upon the Prophets, for the same reason that he would have made a bad commentator upon a profane poet; intimating (what is no doubt true) that the author of the Institutes did not combine with his great logical acumen and power of expression in argument, a corresponding warmth of imagination. It is one of the many merits of Hengstenberg, that he does not forget that the Seer of Israel fulfilled both senses of the word *Vates*. To explain away most solemn truths, as many of Hengstenberg’s rationalistic countrymen have done, by representing them as mere poetic ornaments, is indeed most shocking and sinful; but it does not therefore follow that we shall attain the true sense of God’s Word, by forgetting that it has pleased Him, who gave it, so largely to employ poetry as the vehicle of His revelations. On a previous verse (the 14th) of this eleventh chapter of Zechariah, Hengstenberg justly says:—

‘ We have already had occasion often to remark, that in the representation of *future things* the images are borrowed from the *past*. Thus, e.g., in the tenth chapter, the *future* deliverance is described as a *passage through the Red Sea*; so likewise as a *deliverance from the yoke of the Assyrians and Egyptians*, who had long been deprived of their power at the time of Zechariah.—Such passages would not have been so grossly misunderstood, if more regard had been paid to the analogy of poetry in general, and particularly that of Christian hymns. When, e.g., the poet says—

“ Deep it is not; on boldly—the Red Sea

By God’s command shall make a way for thee!”

who can suppose that he is on the point of passing the Red Sea? or when

¹ Section 610, p. 353, Eng. trans. Ed. Kerchever Arnold.

² P. 349, § 604.

it is said, "*Egypt, good night!*" that he has prepared himself for a journey from Egypt to Canaan? Thus also it is here.¹

But, above all, would we request the student, who would fain examine these matters for himself, to read with care and thoroughly digest the comment of this distinguished interpreter upon Hosea i. 11.

We can only find space for a portion here. [The italics are not ours, either in this or the preceding quotation.]

'A man may be in *Canaan*, and at the same time in *Babylonia* and *Assyria*. It is true, indeed, that in the times of the Old Testament the higher possession and the lower stood in a certain connexion. But where the Lord is not, with his gifts and blessings, there *Canaan* cannot be; it was as a land in which the Lord was present, that it was so valuable and dear to all the pious. From what has been said, it also appears, that, in respect to the historical reference, we ought by no means to stop at the times of the Old Testament, and just as little to dream of a still future return of Israel to *Canaan*. Luther's explanation—"They shall ascend to a heavenly country from this land of their sojourning," is perfectly just, not indeed as to the letter, but as to the reality. It is not the *form* of the Divine inheritance, but the *substance*, which the prophet has in view. Under the New Testament, where the whole earth has become a *Canaan*, the form is changed, the *substance* remains. Under the new covenant, *Canaan* must, even in the north, joyfully bloom for the beloved. The three stations, *Egypt*, the wilderness, and *Canaan*, for ever remain; but we go from one to another, only with the feet of the spirit, not, as under the old covenant, at the same time with the feet of the body. The fulfilment of the prophecy is therefore progressive, and will not terminate until the whole of God's saving plan is completed. It commenced at *Babylon*, was carried forward at the appearance of Christ whom many out of Judah and Israel placed at their head as the common leader to *Canaan*; it is still daily realized in our sight in every Israelite who follows their example; it will hereafter reach the final fulfilment in the last and greatest proof of the covenant faithfulness of God towards Israel, which, happily, is just as much secured by the New Testament as by the Old.'²

Just and admirable as these remarks appear to us, and gladly as we number Hengstenberg among our allies, yet so far as respects the thoughts themselves, perhaps we need hardly have gone to Germany to seek them. Had they not, in great part, been almost literally anticipated by our poet of the Christian Year?

'He is come down to break their chain;

Though never more on Zion's fane

His visible ensign wave;

'Tis *Sion*, wheresoe'er they dwell,

Who, with his own true *Israel*,

Shall own Him strong to save.

He shall redeem them, one by one,

Where'er the world-encircling sun

Shall see them meekly kneel;

All that He asks on *Israel's* part,

Is only, that the captive heart

Its woe and burthen feel.'

¹ P. 349, § 604.

² Pp. 489, 490, § 793.

If we have been fortunate enough to secure a reader who has waded through the prolix repetitions which our course of inquiry has, almost unavoidably, entailed on us, such an one will find no great difficulty in the application of the principles laid down to the particular passages of Holy Scripture, which are commonly appealed to in the present controversy. It may be well, however, to say a few words upon some of these portions of the prophetic writings.

One of the most obvious *prima facie* passages consists of that long description of a rebuilt temple, which occupies the last nine chapters of Ezekiel. It is true that even a literal interpretation of Ezekiel's vision would not establish the point of a Jewish national restoration; nevertheless it will be found to repay a moment's examination. We say a moment's, for surely even the hastiest *second* glance must go far to suggest such thoughts as occurred to our countryman Thomas Fuller:—

'As our Saviour once told Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," so the sense of Ezekiel's land, city, and temple, is not carnal and corporeal, but mystical and spiritual. Yea, God may seem of purpose to have troubled and perplexed the text, emitting the nibbles thereof with inextricable difficulties merely to wean us from the milk of the letter, and make us with more appetite seek for stronger meat therein. For the main, therefore, it is generally conceived, this vision imports the great enlargement and dilatation of the Church under the Gospel, when the Gentiles shall be called to the knowledge of Christ and the Jews also, (as mainly concerned, though not solely intended in this vision,) brought home to their true Messiah, not excluding even those of the ten tribes from having each his portion in the performance of this prophecy.'¹

This comment of Fuller coincides with the judgments of S. Jerome and S. Gregory; nay more, even some of the Jewish Rabbins were compelled to admit that the descriptions here referred to must be figuratively, not literally, interpreted.² The same may be almost repeated concerning the corresponding chapters in the Apocalypse, which are spiritually understood by the great majority even of those who are opposed to us on the questions here at issue.³

Yet let it be well weighed how much is involved in this admission. If there *be* a prophecy, of which men have no right to expect a literal fulfilment, why should that particular prophecy be conceived to stand alone in this respect? Other predictions will be found, we believe, to present, on the literal hypothesis, difficulties as insuperable as those of the vision of Ezekiel.

¹ A Pisgah-sight of Palestine, by Thomas Fuller, B.D. (Lond. A.D. 1650.)

² Corn. à Lap. in Ezech. xl. Synopsis Capitula.

³ Mede, Bp. Newton, and others. We are sorry to have Dr. Todd against us: but much as we value his services, and agree with his *negative* conclusions, we are unable to follow him, in what seems to us an *undue* amount of futurism and adherence to literal interpretations.

Great stress is laid, and not unnaturally, by our opponents, upon those texts which speak of a future union of Ephraim with Judah; such as Jeremiah l. 4, 5; and Ezekiel xxxvii. 15—19. One famous commentator, Cornelius à Lapide, thinks that such passages have already received a literal fulfilment, inasmuch as Cyrus and Artaxerxes gave permission to the *ten* tribes, as well as the *two*, to return to Palestine; a permission, he says, of which Josephus intimates that many Israelites availed themselves.¹ Such a solution we would gladly adopt; but it is not, we fear, borne out by the facts of the case. We cannot see in Josephus such an intimation as à Lapide attributes to him, and are therefore content (with S. Austin and with Hengstenberg) to look only for that spiritual completion made by the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ our Lord, already commenced (Ephes. ii. 11—22), and to be perfected more fully hereafter. Why should this promise be literally fulfilled any more than those made to the sons of Levi or to David?

The return, again, is promised in this same chapter of Ezekiel (xxxvii. 24, 25). Most true, but it is connected with the renewed reign of David as their prince. Now as none, not even the Jews, believe in a return of the son of Jesse, with what consistency can we understand one half of this promise according to the letter, and the remainder spiritually?

The promises, with which Amos closes his prophecy, are also largely dwelt upon. Certainly they are, at first sight, perhaps the strongest that can be urged in favour of a re-establishment of Israel in Palestine. But, then, is not this the very passage which is always held to have been referred to by the first Bishop of Jerusalem, S. James the Less, in the earliest Council of Christ's Church? Let us look at his inspired commentary. 'And to this agree (*συμφωνοῦσιν*) the words of the prophets, 'as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up. *That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.*' (Acts xv. 15—17.) If S. James applies the prophecy of Amos to illustrate S. Peter's declaration 'how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His name,' (Ib. ver. 14,) does he not thereby almost exclude the idea of a subsequent fulfilment after the letter; does he not lend a most weighty and important sanction to our interpretation of the similar passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and, through these, to the general principles maintained throughout the process of our argument?

¹ Corn. & Lap. in Jer. l. 4.

One more passage, and one only, shall be considered by us. In the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, we read as follows:—‘And it shall come to pass in that day, *that* the Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.’

The well-known *dictum* of Bishop Butler, that, in cases of conscience, *first* impressions are the most trustworthy, cannot be extended to matters involving critical study and argumentative research. Upon the verses before us, the student who is not confident of the justice of his own first hasty conclusions, may enjoy the advantage of comparing the criticisms of three commentators of different communions—Bishop Lowth, Cornelius à Lapide, and Campegius Vitringa. They are no mean judges, no unfavourable representatives of their respective Churches. Lowth’s lectures upon Hebrew Sacred Poetry have been most honourably re-edited in Germany; the Jesuit, à Lapide, has won (as Dr. Charles Maitland truly remarks), by his learning and judgment, the respect of the learned of all communions; the Dutch commentator, Vitringa, if in controversy wildly ultra-Protestant, is in other respects not only sane and practical, but exhibits that union of reasoning power with fervour of imagination, which men justly denominate genius. All three were endowed with gifts of heart as well as of head, and treat their hallowed subjects with reverent thoughtfulness of spirit.

Now, upon the text before us, *all three are perfectly agreed*. All three maintain that, whatever degree of literal fulfilment may have been already granted to this prophecy, none other than spiritual fulfilment can henceforth be looked for by the Church.

The English bishop states his conviction briefly, without entering into much detail. ‘A Lapide is more copious: he recounts, according to his custom, the different opinions of illustrious critics with respect to ‘the second time’ alluded to by the Prophet, which naturally involve some contrariety of sentiments respecting the *first* time. His own judgment inclines towards regarding the deliverance from Egypt through Moses as the *first*, from the world, and sin, and Satan, through Christ as the *second* deliverance. This latter ‘recovery of the

remnant' is, of course, in perpetual progress, and awaits its complete consummation at the judgment of the last great day. Special attention, however, is called to the manner in which the Apostles were permitted to gather 'Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven,' into the fold of Christ upon the wonderful day of Pentecost.

Far more lengthy and elaborate are the masterly comments of Vitringa; and the student, whether convinced by them or not, can hardly fail to profit greatly by an inspection of them. He dwells, even more strongly than à Lapide, upon the very large fulfilment of the promises here uttered by Isaiah, which was granted in the events of the first Whit-Sunday; a view, we may observe, which seems sanctioned by the English Church, in that she has appointed this chapter to be read as a Lesson in the service for that high festival. If Vitringa be at times (as we must think) disposed to reject too hastily evangelic interpretations, to shrink too much from what is supernatural, to regard too lightly the *consensus* of Fathers and the judgments of the early and undivided Church, then of all the more authority is his decision when uninfluenced by the bias of such tendencies.

In the present instance, he proceeds to contrast the conclusions he has formed with the Judaic interpretation of these glorious promises. 'But we do not hold,' our opponents will say, 'that Judaic view reprehended by Vitringa.' No, indeed, they do not hold it in all that completeness and consistency with which Rabbins have long maintained it. They do not expect Messiah as an earthly conqueror: they do not (excepting, perhaps, a few of the Irvingite persuasion) expect a restoration of Jewish rites and Jewish sacrifices, either as typical or commemorative of the One adorable offering. But let them look well to it, whether a theory of Judaic origin can cease to be Judaic in its essence by the elimination of a few of its grossest elements. Let them consider whether Vitringa would have allowed them the benefit of this plea. Let them think whether they could possibly have escaped from the scourge of his indignant eloquence:—

'Finally (that I may close this unavoidable digression), I would have the exposition of this prophecy which I have delivered, and which is suited to the conditions of the true reign of Christ, compared with that of the Jews, (a literal and carnal one, which they set forth in accordance with *their* conditions,) that its merit be estimated on good grounds. What do those unhappy ones here see? what do they here seek? Forsooth, that they will some day have a Messiah, who will redeem and collect them from among the Gentiles, amongst whom they are hitherto dispersed; who, overcoming their enemies that would fain thwart this design, will bring back his fellow-tribesmen into Canaan; there again erect a kingdom after the fashion of David and Solomon when most prosperous; restore the

Temple and the carnal Levitical worship, and, fixing his seat at Jerusalem, fiercely assault their enemies the Philistines (only they are no longer in existence) towards the West, and the Arabs on the East, and *thus* reap glory for Himself and for his people. How noble, how great, how magnificent is all this! *Yea, rather, how empty, poor and null! Rather, how unworthy of a Divine King, the Perfect, the Peacemaker, the Teacher and the Saviour alike of Gentile and of Jew!* What shall it profit these wretched ones to enjoy such blessings—blessings of a nature that must either prove poor and of slight account, or else only procurable with grievous damage to the recipients? What shall it profit them again to occupy and inhabit Canaan, at present deserted, which few would wish to inhabit, and thither, at great inconvenience, to transfer their homes? Of what avail for them, when the world is waxing old, to renew an ancient carnal worship, long since obsolete, from which the majority of Gentiles through the wide earth now refrain, and *without* which they themselves trust that they can still be saved? Of what use to wage war with the nations, to inflict and to receive blows, and, under the leadership of the Messiah, to rage against their adversaries with prodigious slaughter? *I ask, further, whether Canaan could contain all the dispersed, and what will be the loss suffered by those who shall be deprived of this privilege?* I say, then, that they are blind hearts and vilest slaves of sense, who feed themselves on such an hope, which, if they should attain it most completely, would make them not one whit more happy and more blessed. *There is one real Redemption, spiritual, Divine, which does make the redeemed blessed, whose effects are life-giving: and he who comprehends that the Prophets spake of this, he attains their true meaning.*—*Vitringa in Jesaiam*, xi. 11, § vii. (tom. i. p. 457, Ed. Herbornæ, A.D. 1715).

And with this noble piece of writing, though weakened by translation from the vigorous Latin of its author, we might well conclude our case, and leave it to the reader's judgment. We must not, indeed, venture, after all, to *dogmatise* upon the subject of unfulfilled prophecy. Jerusalem on earth *may* yet be intended to become the scene of awful and striking events; it may be the first seat of Antichrist, or the spot where the true Messiah shall manifest Himself once more. All that we *do* maintain is, that the temporal restoration of the Jewish race, is, to say the least, a highly improbable event; and many, we believe, who have been content to adopt the theory upon trust, will own the strength and variety of the objections which even the slightest examination must disclose. If there be any force in the considerations we have ventured to put forth; if the long silence of ages prove anything at all in the way of negative evidence; if the judgment of such men as Tertullian and Origen, S. Jerome and S. Chrysostom, Pascal, Hengstenberg, and Vitringa, (each singly powerful, how much more so when combined,) can exercise any lawful influence over the minds of those who reverence authority; if the arguments of these great writers, considered by themselves, apart from authorship, be neither light nor trivial; if, lastly, the opposite view be Judaic in its origin, of late date in the Church, unsupported by many interpreters of name, based on a most question-

able system of *exegesis*, and but too often blended with unsound and degrading applications of Holy Scripture; then surely men should pause ere they hastily adopt that view.

So abundant, indeed, is the divine blessing upon all sincerity, that it can hardly be doubted but that much good may have been permitted to arise even from expectations which we must believe to rest upon a sadly weak foundation. Many of the excellent persons, who hold the opinions we have been engaged in controverting, have been led, by the interest thus awakened, to do more for the conversion of the Jews in Europe, as likewise in the East. And it may be that some of us, who are unable to admit the territorial theory, have allowed ourselves to be too much repulsed by the insincerity of some Jewish converts, and the avarice and meanness of the unconverted; and have thus come to disregard that hapless people in our thoughts and alms-giving and prayers, and to forget their claims as the earthly descendants of our great spiritual forefathers. We are not, therefore, to rush into the opposite extreme: we must not dare to palliate the greatness of that crime which is the cause of all their sufferings, nor argue (as has once been done of late) that if the Sacrifice was so infinitely holy, those who brought it about could not be so *very* guilty. This sophism was long since anticipated by Aquinas;¹ and he suggests the just, and indeed almost obvious, reply, that actions are as their motives; and that, consequently, the offering which was made, on the part of the Eternal Son, from the most perfect love and obedience to the Father, and the sublimest compassion for the souls of men, bore an entirely different aspect from the same deed, when regarded as the work of the Jewish people, who caused it to be done under the influence of envy, malice, and unbelief. But as concerning human nature itself, so too with respect to Judaism, there seems to be a twofold view, of which neither side may be lost sight of with impunity. Of this our human nature we are taught to believe that, though miserably fallen through the sin of the *first* Adam, it is yet capable of marvellous restoration to righteousness, even here on earth, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, won for it by the *second* Adam. The world does not really admit the truth of either phase of such a doctrine. Its thorough votaries begin by denying the depth of man's corruption, and end with disbelief in the very existence of human goodness and human sanctity. Somewhat similarly, perhaps, must we beware of overlooking either side of truth as concerns the race of Israel. The long series of rejections of God's messengers, which culminated in the casting out and slaying the Heir of the inheritance Himself; the thwartings and persecutions

¹ Summa Theologiæ. Pars tertia.

exercised by Jews against the infant Church; the sanguinary feuds among themselves, which darkened the last days of their retention of Jerusalem; the covetousness, extortions, hypocrisy, which have disgraced their name in all lands; their reception of numberless false Messiahs, as, for instance, Barchochébas in the second, and Sabbathai Sevi in the seventeenth century; these are *facts* which must not be overlooked, for assuredly their record is on high. But as little should we wish to blot out the *remembrance* of what the Jews *have been*, or the *hope* of what they *may be*. They *have been* the appointed channel of God's mercy to mankind at large: the recipients of His oracles; His adopted sons, bound to Him by special covenant; subjects of His law; a light amid the darkness of Heathendom; maintainers of the true worship; heirs of the promises; the children of the Patriarchs, the kinsmen of the Prophets, the fathers of the Apostles and first Martyrs; the brethren, according to the flesh, of the One true and perfect Man, who is the Saviour of the world, Christ Jesus the Lord, from heaven, the Eternal Son, the Second Person of the ever-blessed and undivided Trinity. They *may be*, ere the world's last sun has set, the most devoted of all the worshippers of Christ.

Both aspects are patent upon the face of Holy Scripture. Prophets alternately bless and denounce: Jerusalem is as Sodom, and yet 'the holy City;' the Redeemer Himself weeps over it, and concludes with a tender lament, the most tremendous outburst of righteous indignation, which He, the meek and merciful, was ever known to utter upon earth.¹ S. Paul, in continual sorrow for his brethren, praying that they might be saved, recounting all their glories in the past, wishing himself *anathema* for their sakes,² is yet *compelled* to turn from them to the Gentile world,³ and to leave it on record that in his day 'they please not God and are contrary to all men: forbidding us 'to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up 'their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.'⁴ And yet it is this same Apostle who promises that, for all this, they *may be*—nay surely *shall be*—again in the latter days, believing, repentant, pardoned, and accepted of God. It is the recognition of this duplex character of Judaism which gives life and meaning to that affecting poem in the *Christian Year*, from which we have already borrowed:⁵ it is this which lends force to that fine comparison of the earthly Israel to the 'Œdipus Coloneus' of Sophocles, which many will remember in the pages of the *Lyra Apostolica*:—

¹ S. Matt. xxiii.² Romans ix. 2, x. 1. ix. 4, 5, 3.³ Acts xiii. 46. xviii. 6. xxviii. 28.⁴ 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.⁵ The Burning Bush. Fifth Sunday in Lent.

' O piteous race !
 Fearful to look upon,
 Once standing in high place,
 Heaven's eldest son.
 O aged blind,
 Unvenerable ! as thou flitest by,
 I liken thee to him in pagan song,
 In thy gaunt majesty,
 The vagrant king, of haughty-purposed mind,
 Whom prayer nor plague could bend ;
 Wrong'd, at the cost of him who did the wrong,
 Accurs'd himself, but in his cursing strong,
And honour'd in his end.'

We have said that even mistaken notions, as we deem them, may have been mixed with truth, and converted to good ends. But it does not thence follow that any systematic misinterpretation of God's Word can be otherwise than a great and serious evil. If, among the expectants of a temporal restoration of Israel and return to Canaan, there are *some* who are sober and cautious students of Holy Writ, with the majority the idea but too often includes there most wild and unworthy notions, interpretations of Scripture quite derogatory to the dignity of God's Word, which is thereby connected with events of the most trivial, circumscribed, and ephemeral nature. But too often do the supporters of such views betray the presence of a Judaic element in their creed, which is one of the most marked and painful characteristics of their entire school of theology.¹ But too often does there appear to be a lack of appreciation of the wonderful blessings which (despite all the miserable infirmities and short-comings of individuals and communities) Christianity has wrought for mankind; the evil state of classic Paganism, Buddhism, and Bramanism is disregarded, and the greatness and glory of Christ's Church remains unrecognised. But to dwell upon the Church's greatness leads, it will be urged, to placing the Church in the first place in men's hearts, and its Divine founder in the second. Doubtless such an error may exist, and it is a sad and miserable one. But so may similar ills arise from the proclamation of any Divine truth. Reverence for God's Word—homage and love to the Only-begotten Son—what verities can be more sacred? Yet teaching the one has been known to lead to a most injurious Bibliolatry; to a regard for the letter, and a loss of its spirit: and gratitude to the Saviour has been at times permitted to engender the pernicious heresy, which would regard the Second Person of the Holy Trinity as mild and merciful, and the First Person as only

¹ See Mr. Samuel Lucas's able Essay on '*History as a condition of Progress*.'—(Murray.) We might quote too the Edinburgh reviewer on *Church Parties*; but we mislike such allies;—*Danaos et dona ferentes*.

wrathful and severe—as if there could be a divided will in the Unity of the Divine Majesty. Shall we, therefore, cease to make known these solemn truths? *Μὴ γένοιτο*. In sooth, there is hardly any idea intellectually more feeble, or morally and religiously more mischievous, than that which would represent a thorough and hearty belief in *one* article of the Creed as incompatible with sound acceptance of *another*. It is the very groundwork of all heresy and misbelief. Do not honour the Son, said the Arian; you detract from the glory of the Father. Do not preach a Trinity, says the Mahometan; you interfere with the sublime truth of the Unity, &c., &c., &c. There is no end to objections of this kind. Yet few can be more utterly unscriptural than the charge of dishonour being done to the Lord of lords, by a proclamation of the claims of His Bride, the Church of God. It is in the Psalms, the Prayer-book of Christians for all time, that we are told not only of the true David, but likewise of the true Jerusalem. It is the Evangelic Prophet (*Evangelista potius quàm propheta*, as he has been truly termed) who foretells the Man of sorrows, yet also expatiates on the splendours of that kingdom which even upon earth is full of the divinest grandeur, though its glories be invisible to carnal eyes, its melodies unheard of unpurged ears. It is the Apostle born out of due time, to whom Jesus appeared on the road to Damascus, who speaks not only of Him who was long-suffering, but likewise of that spiritual union betwixt Christ and His Church, which was symbolised by the matrimony of our first parents, while yet in Paradise. It is the loved disciple ‘which leaned on His breast at supper,’ who was cheered in his lonely exile not only by the sight of the glorified ‘Son of man,’ but also by the vision of the New Jerusalem, the Lamb’s Wife, the Bride adorned for her husband. Oh! if many of those whom we love and honour, and would fain imitate in goodness, would but lay these things to heart, they would surely drop the notion of earthly, local, territorial, theories, and look rather for the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ’s Church, as she is, and far more as she shall one day be.

But at least we have here one ground of union. The Churches at large, despite their terrible and mournful schisms, can join *with heartfelt hope* in *one* prayer, beyond those based upon the Creeds which are the common heritage of Christendom. We may all sue for mercy on God’s ancient people, and pray that God ‘would fetch them home to His flock, that they may be ‘saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made ‘one fold under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ, our Lord.’ *Ita fiat, O Domine! fiat voluntas tua!*

ART. V.—*Voltaire and his Times*. By L. F. BUNGNER. Authorized translation. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable & Co. 1854.

CUSTOM, fashion, and the habits of an age, are at all times interesting and curious subjects of inquiry. Mankind are swayed to and fro, by mysterious unseen influences, to approve at one time what at another they most condemn; to run mad after a fancy of the moment, which is afterwards forgotten or despised. Popular delusions are a study of themselves, and have their history wherewith to accuse the human race of never-ending waves of folly. The delusion of table-turning has within a few weeks been thought worthy of public refutation on scientific principles, as part of a distinguished course of lectures delivered at the Royal Institution, before royalty itself. But fashion has its sway unchecked in very many departments of human life; and can defy all science, all discretion, and even all religion. Where it effects those things only that are legitimate objects of variety, it is useful and refreshing. Much *ennui* is avoided in a large class of our fellow-subjects by the difference of angle subtended in the position of a bonnet. The eye is quickened, and the mind kept alive, by many of the innocent novelties that succeed each other in the stream of life. The great ocean itself is not stagnant, but presents an ever-changing face—an example followed by all Nature, if studied with an observant eye. The objects, however, effected by this power of fashion are not always such as admit of variety without serious consequences to the deepest interest of our being. The consideration of this fickle influence assumes a very different aspect when we see that a blind obedience to her has led a whole generation into the denial of all religion, and to professed infidelity.

In France, during the eighteenth century, it was the fashion to be an infidel; it was the mark of an inquiring mind, the symbol of intelligence. A strong religious conviction, such as at all times is a rare quality, was then necessary in order to avoid what now seems the extremity of wickedness, and almost insanity. Men in these days, who take their ideas from the habits of the age—and are, in accordance with them, induced to present a respectable exterior, and even talk of religion with some degree of solemnity and approval—would, very many of them, have been professed infidels, if their lot had been cast in France of the last century, and they had possessed no greater earnestness than now serves their purpose, and allows them to remain respect-

able. We are not indeed to suppose that the mass of a nation are really no better for a general respect to religion, and for Christianity being, as it were, the fashion. We are bound, of course, to see the greatest advantage in the prevalence of truth over error; but very little discernment of human motives is necessary to convince our plain understanding, that in comparing the religion of one age with another, we must take into calculation on the one side a large number of individuals whose profession of the Christian faith is materially influenced by fashion, and who, under other circumstances, would hold very different language.

The book now before us is an irregular and informal history of this period of infidelity in France; and of all the works of its author which we have read, it is the most interesting and the most full of genuine information and anecdote. True and useful sentiments are also interspersed here and there, which show considerable thought and clearness of mind in the analysis both of individual motives and of general political principles. The style of M. Bungener is always somewhat rambling, and his progress is often through mazes and jungles, in which the reader needs quick attention if he would not be lost; but with patience, either on the one hand to follow the argument, or on the other to endure a temporary cessation of interest, he is always rewarded before long by some interesting touches of sentiment or description, some facts or pictures.

Voltaire is made the centre and spirit of this infidel school. Its gradual approach is described, its influences on social life, on the drama, on art, and on politics, are traced; the want of truthfulness and morality encouraged by it is exposed, and the hypocrisy of some of its main professions successfully laid open.

The history of this period has been often written, but M. Bungener very truly observes that a useful history of such times, and of such men, should be written with reference to their bearing on the existing state of society. M. Villemain's history he considers now obsolete.

'More than one friend has asked me, sometimes in serious alarm about me, sometimes perhaps with an approach to a sneer, whether then I proposed to retouch Villemain. My answer then, as it is now, was that M. Villemain has had few more constant or sincere admirers than I; but would he himself, I added, had he the same things to treat now, treat them as he did then? Twenty years have almost doubled the distance that parted us from the last century, when he finished his review of it. Twenty years,—it is more than Tacitus called *grande mortalis ævi spatium*. Twenty years,—it is much at any epoch, and, in our days, seems almost an age.—*Voltaire and his Times*, pp. iii. iv.

This now antique line is thus described:—

'That line lay in an odd enough middle course between the old scepticism, which was decidedly in disgrace as frigid and in bad taste, and Christianity, which had come back, but with the accompaniment of Jesuits and confession-tickets. He behoved neither to attack it, for that would have been taken ill as a mere reproduction of Voltaire, nor to defend it, at least directly, for the public would have cried out that he was a Jesuit. He had to respect both his enemies and himself, both the *Encyclopédie* and the Gospel, both the Monarchy and the Revolution; he had to erect a temple in which both Voltaire and *the wretch* should have their thrones.'—Pp. iv. v.

M. Bungener would be more severe towards the eighteenth century. It was an age of harsh judgment on others, and it therefore deserved no indulgence towards itself. His severity, however, is a witness to the power of its leading men.

'Yet it is not without a certain fearfulness that we approach it. It had such an overweening confidence in itself. It looked with such a lofty and distant air on whoever dared to seem to criticise it. Like one of those dead corpses which, although dead, still keep you at a distance, and which you find it difficult to figure to yourself motionless, powerless, the prey of worms: your imagination resuscitates them; you seem to hear their voice, and quail before them as they eye you.

'More than once has this feeling come over me as I worked at this book. I seemed to wander in an immense cemetery peopled with the dead of yesterday, whose wraiths prowled about their graves, themselves invisible, but seeing me, following me. I felt as if some restless eye looked over my shoulder to read the line I had scrolled; I could almost have feared, on looking round, to find myself confronted with the men I had been dissecting. Yes, in the course of my long watchings, at the hour when the expiring lamp flickers in its socket, and when fatigue is fever, more than once I seemed to hear, at my very ear, the grinning laugh which Ferney sent abroad to all the echoes of Europe. The man who for sixty years had laughed at everything and everybody, I could not but fancy laughing still, and laughing too a little at myself.'—Pp. vii. viii.

The genius of Voltaire is not described by M. Bungener as leading the mind of his age, but rather as anticipating it. He is not one of those who 'lays hold of all the vital forces of society, and gathers them into his hand;' he is rather consecrated to the tastes of the multitude. Voltaire, indeed, seems to have been the spokesman of many secret and undeveloped sentiments that were already smouldering in men's minds. He does not fill people's minds with powerful inspirations, but by his satire and his philosophy he compels all around him to a certain consistency of evil. He exposes both real and apparent fallacies; and, commencing by a keen and well-aimed attack on the practical inconsistency of Christians, he proceeds to drag those whom he has got hold of into a denial of the whole principle of Christian faith. He thus acquired an astonishing hatred of Christianity, which pursued him in whatever he did, and which was the more intense and the more wonderful from the absence of any personal feeling of dislike towards eminent individual Christians, or from any natural moroseness of temper. Infidelity, as we can occasion-

ally witness it, is generally the result of a misanthropic gloomy mind, which has fed itself on ill tempers till it ends in a kind of impious rebellion against heavenly as well as earthly powers. Voltaire, however, was not a man of bad temper or of sullen passions. He was fond of society; he had the means of enjoying it; and no man ever passed through a long life with more freedom from care, with more of his own way, or with more apparent comfort, than Voltaire. He was prudence itself in forestalling the means of passing through any temporary persecution which his writings might draw down upon him. He bought an estate which was partly in France, partly in Switzerland, and partly in the Genevese territory. He was thus prepared, like a prize-fighter, to cross the boundary and escape pursuit. He possessed a large fortune in transferable securities belonging to all manner of places and countries; and then he indulged in a peaceful retirement, surrounded by cheerful and flattering guests, and engaged in correspondence with all the great people of Europe.

Voltaire and Rousseau are names which ever go together as the great bugbears of quiet, respectable citizens, and the dread of all who fear sceptics. They form the link between the apparent prosperity of Church and State in the age of Louis XIV. and the downfall of both in the Revolution. They were engaged for many years in preparing the country for that final crash, which was at one time supposed to terminate the history of France. But France has great vitality, and for this reason—that her recorded history as a nation has always been too much comprised in the history of a class. At one time the aristocracy was France, and when it fell France seemed to fall with it; but after this apparent destruction, it was found that others soon occupied the vacant places; and, in fact, that the rest of the nation are a perpetual reserve, from which the ranks of the dominant class can be supplied when a catastrophe takes place. The Parisians have since then been France, as regards history. But this historical France we have seen convulsed as if the country itself was at an end, when it has soon after appeared that the sufferers were but a fraction whose place was at once supplied; the *part* we had looked on too much as the *whole*. The same mistake is made by those who consider that Voltaire and his school were bringing all France to destruction by their writings, and were calling down a curse on the whole people. It is a more true view of the case to identify both the men and their principles with that class only which was the dominant, and at the same time the sinning class, in France. The aristocracy had been luxurious and oppressive; they had become wholly immoral, and religion was almost extinct. It was time, then, that their

day should end, and so it was ordained to be; but the instruments that paved the way for it were not the spontaneous vengeance of the populace, or the rising of the oppressed; they were men whose whole aim was to influence themselves, who, with a diabolical craft and artfulness, dragged them down step by step from bad to worse, till all their sin and unbelief was unmasked, and they stood in open day an accursed race, enemies to God and man, at the mercy of the first wave of popular excitement that should rise up. France herself was never infidel; the faith of Christ has always dwelt securely among the peasants, and in the provinces generally. Voltaire was so true an aristocrat that he did not think the vulgar worth converting to infidelity. He rather wished Christianity to continue their religion, in order to keep both it and them in the greater contempt. The comparison between Voltaire and Rousseau helps to illustrate the intensity of the former in his cause. His hatred of Christianity was even the opportunity for an agreeable absence of egotism in the writer.

‘Here, perhaps, there is a fresh paradox; but it strikes me that Voltaire, with his levity of tone and his never-ending sarcasms, was the more serious man of the age than his grave and sententious rival. All his sayings, for him, hit the mark; all his shafts pierced to the quick. The work of the age was his: none more entirely devoted to it. He does not say so, but people know it, and nobody in Europe doubts it; while what Rousseau seeks, above all things, is Rousseau. Voltaire liberally put his glory at the service of the cause; Rousseau always let it be seen, in serving it, that he ever thought more of himself than it, and that, in reality, he cared little about its triumph. Voltaire asked not for martyrdom, but for victory; Rousseau wanted only the struggle, and in it sought only for the name of martyr. “He would be delighted to be hanged,” said Voltaire, “provided his name were in the sentence.”—P. xiii.

Of Voltaire it is said that he thought men naturally bad, and dealt gently with them; and of Rousseau that he thought them naturally good, but spoilt by civilisation. The one looked on civilisation as a remedy, the other as a poison.

‘In their whole character and movements, we see the same diversity, the same contrasts. The one does his best to add to the influence of talents that of position and riches; the other glories in being nothing, and in having nothing. Voltaire speaks of “my château,” and is none the prouder at bottom; Rousseau complains of the high price of bread, and you can see pride peeping through the holes in his mantle. They both spend their lives in complaints—the poor man of his voluntary poverty, the rich one of his failing health, still endurable after living eighty years. But Voltaire passes jests on his maladies, even when real; Rousseau would fain that the whole human race should weep with him over his, even when imaginary. Often, moreover, they both make themselves ridiculous—the one by his seriousness about trifles, the other by his levity on the gravest subjects. But the latter, with his inexhaustible malice, is sometimes kindly; the former, with his universal philanthropy, has always some gall in his ink, and sometimes a great deal.—Pp. xvii. xviii.

The views which animated these two men in their hatred of Christianity were different in their origin, but their result was the same. Voltaire promised happiness on its destruction, whereas the other had no special hatred for it, except as being part of civilisation. He would have men wild and solitary, like beasts of the field; whereas Voltaire preferred wealth and literary society. Both, however, agreed in the sentiment which prompted the perseverance in infidelity, described as follows:—

‘What a guard, accordingly, was kept around the dying agony of any one who had once become a liege member of the destructive party! What alarm was felt lest there should escape from him a word, a sign, that might suggest a scruple to the survivors! What haste shown to overwhelm with calumny or ridicule any one who might have wished to inspire the dying man with a little repentance for his past life—a little faith in that future whither death was about to hurry his soul!’—P. xxi.

How great must have been the change in the literary world of France, which presents to us Voltaire in the eighteenth century, in contrast with the writers of France in the seventeenth century! That was an age, both in France and in England, for standard writers of genuine worth, and moreover of simple minds. That century will long survive the literary fame of its successor; yet what contempt must the infidels of the latter have felt for such men as the following:—

‘Look, for example, at Morin, the botanist, “going to bed at seven o’clock at night all the year round, and rising at two in the morning. He spent three hours in prayer. Between five and six in summer, and in winter between six and seven, he went to the Hôtel-Dieu, and most frequently heard mass at Notre-Dame. On coming back, he read the Holy Scriptures, and dined at eleven o’clock. He next went to the Royal Garden, and remained in fine weather till two, examining new plants, and satisfying his first and strongest passion. After that, he shut himself up at home, unless he happened to have some poor people to visit.” What a peaceful life! Would not one say he was entering one of those silent libraries on the very threshold of which one is tempted to uncover and almost to kneel?’—P. 24.

Or even for the two Corneilles:—

‘This blessed calm enjoyed by the friends of science, was enjoyed also by almost all the friends of letters, alike the humblest and the most illustrious. See the two Corneilles, lodged the one above the other, and asking one another for words and verses through a hole opened in the ceiling.’—P. 25.

Or for the Abbé de Dangeau, who on hearing of the battle of Blenheim, affectionately laid his hand on his old bureau, and said, ‘Come what may, I have safe here three thousand verbs, all rightly conjugated.’

The first link in the chain, which gradually led from these quiet worshippers of literature for its own sake, to the stormy disputants of the age of Voltaire, was the *good* Rollin. He was

claimed by the movement party as on their side, though himself unconscious of the honour, being wholly devoted to academical occupations. In spite, however, of his religious character, and in spite also of the fact that his writings were chiefly in Latin, he was yet supposed to be a man of progress, for he had an independence of character which brought him into collision with authorities both in Church and State.

'As a professor, he had preached the old rules, but with an independence of attitude, and a hardihood of taste, which amounted to a satire on pedants. As Rector of the University, he had upheld, when necessary, antiquated privileges; but even this had brought him into conflict with other authorities, and it was not forgotten that he had braved the archbishop.'—Pp. 30, 31.

Rollin's 'Ancient History' and 'Roman History' came out when he was in the enjoyment of unbounded favour, and met with a success that astonished him.

"Thus it was that the man who seemed the least fitted to belong to the eighteenth century, not only belonged to it, but became, through the force of circumstances, one of its foremost promoters."—P. 34.

Others, in their various ways, were made to aid on the cause.

'We might mention Vertot with his drowsy *Revolutions*, and d'Aguesseau with his serious *Discourses*. The former of these taught, unintentionally, what a revolted population could do; the latter taught men, under an absolute monarch, to lisp the language of the free. He called the Parliament the *senate*, and the councillors *senators*; he opened the way to declamations on the dignity of man, and the rights of virtue.'—P. 34.

The ashes of the dead were also disturbed to find witnesses in favour of the movement. Fénelon's was a name much to be desired, and accordingly his religious sentiments were made to bear the following construction.

"What was religion in his view?" we find Maury asking himself, in 1771. "A sublime philosophy which demonstrates the order and the unity of Nature, and explains the enigma of the human heart, which, without it, is incomprehensible; the most powerful motive leading man to good, seeing faith places him constantly before the eye of the Divinity, and acts upon the will with as much sovereign power as it exercises over the thoughts; a supplement of the conscience, which commands, fortifies, and perfects all the virtues—establishes new bonds of good-will on the new relations of humanity—shows us, in the poor, creditors and judges; in our enemies, brethren; in the Supreme Being, a Father; the religion of the heart, virtue in action, the finest of all the codes of morality, and one whose every precept is a blessing from heaven. Such was Christianity in the eyes of Fénelon."—Pp. 35, 36.

This was a philosophical, but not a real Fénelon. He had, however, been a man of opposition like Rollin, and therefore the movement party sympathized with him, and were determined to construe his religion in a way that suited their own objects. Massillon was also cried up by the philosophers. All the polishing of his sermons, which occupied his latter years,

was at the sacrifice of a bold enunciation of Christian doctrine; and therefore Voltaire took him up, though no doubt his admiration for his style as a writer was genuine and sincere.

Meanwhile these opinions made rapid progress, encouraged by those concessions made from time to time by religious people in hope of attaining a common ground, on which persons of different opinions could unite. M. Bungener draws a moral from this, for the benefit of France, during the commotions of the last few years; and the same lesson is applicable to ourselves, and is, we think, felt by many to good purpose. Voltaire's tactics, in spreading his infidel opinions, were of a very artful kind in making himself all things to all men; they led him into the grossest flattery.

'During his last visit to Paris, Lemierre and Dubelloy called on him. "What consoles me in the prospect of death," said he, "is the thought that I shall leave behind MM. Dubelloy and Lemierre." So off they went, both mighty proud, yet each with no less mighty a contempt for the other. "Poor Dubelloy!" Lemierre would say, "he did not see in the least that Voltaire was laughing at him." "That poor fellow Lemierre!" the other would say, "he has taken it into his head that Voltaire was in earnest." —P. 49.

He was very fond of the epithet 'great men,' so much the fashion in that age.

'Voltaire, to whom this title was most generally accorded, was also the most lavish in bestowing it on others. With it he paid his physician Tronchin, who, it is true, deserved it better than most men. He wrote to Vauvernargues: "This age did not deserve you; but so it is that it possesses you, and I bless Nature. I said a year ago that you are a great man." He wrote to Thomas: "You are made to celebrate great men. It is your vocation to portray your fellows." And when he loses Madame Chatelet, his female friend, as he could not, in good French, call her *grande femme*, it is still *grand homme*, great man, that we find him calling her when, in writing to the King of Prussia, he says, "I have lost a friend of five-and-twenty years' standing, a great man, who had but the one fault of being a woman." —P. 50.

Voltaire sneered at Corneille for dedicating his 'Cinna' to M. de Moutauron the financier, and calling him another Augustus, but his own compliments to the rich Helvetius were much more fulsome. This man having written a few verses which were soon forgotten, Voltaire addresses him 'My dear rival, my poet, my philosopher.'

'But let a regal crown at last overpower his vision, or, at least, authorize his acting like a man whose sight is overpowered, we then find him out-Heroding Herod in the fulsomeness of his eulogies.' It will be evident that we speak of his flatteries to the King of Prussia. —P. 53.

This king was but a second-rate author, and often made sad blunders even in spelling, yet Voltaire's addresses to him are thus noticed:—

'Let us say nothing of mere words, for of these there is an infinite variety. *Great man* rarely occurs; it had become hackneyed. *Here*, too, was rather too common a term; but as Frederick seemed not to disdain it, it is occasionally applied to him. *Genius* was very well in its way; but some such epithet as *universal* or *unique* is always studiously added. We shall not find the prince called a *great soul*, for that sounds rather classical; and then, too, he did not believe in the soul; but it must be *thirty souls in one body*, and that satisfied both. *Your Majesty* being too much of an old-world expression, it is made *Your Immensity*. Frederick is the *Solomon of the North*, and the eighteenth century is the *age of Frederick*.'—P. 54.

Humble enough in estimating his own powers, the king amply repaid this flattery:—

'Racine went very far, even for that period, when he maintained, that what most of all should encourage the Academy in its labours on the French language, was the thought of its serving, and being likely ever better and better to serve, for the celebration of the renown of Louis XIV.

'What in that poet's mouth had been a mere hyperbole for an occasion, Frederick made, in some sort, a reality in his relations with Voltaire. He seemed to study French only to enable him to praise Voltaire in his own tongue; and all those niceties of expression which he succeeded in reaching, well or ill, with his somewhat heavy pen, he was proud to offer, as a bouquet of French flowers raised in Germany, to the man to whose pages he had owed so much.'—P. 56.

Again:—

"Your works would be enough to immortalize twenty great men." "None but a god could comprise in one person all the perfections you possess." "Fable tells us of a giant who had a hundred arms. You have a hundred geniuses; you embrace the whole universe, as Atlas bore it on his shoulders." "You are the first-born of thinking beings." "You are the hero of reason, the Prometheus of our days, who brought celestial light for the illumination of the blind." "Although I have come into the world too soon to be present at the triumph of philosophy, I do not regret it; I have seen Voltaire." "I will end my letter as Louis XIV. did his epistle to Boileau: *I admire, and am dumb*."—P. 58.

To show the very theoretical nature of the declamations against despotism which first issued forth from this school of philosophers, it is curious to find a work of Helvetius on this subject dedicated to the Empress of Russia, the most absolute sovereign in Europe. There was a strange fusion between the old and the new ideas. Many fancied themselves the friends of liberty, and sung its praises, who were little willing to bring home to themselves any practical inconsistency between their theories and their practice. Thus it was that democratic and infidel views sprung from the vices of the aristocracy, and that, as a class, it was made to rear up its own destroyers. It was a kind of intellectual refinement to enjoy the very inconsistency of advocating liberty and democracy, while at the same time practically revelling in a system which rested on the extreme reverse. There were forward young divines, who aimed at being in advance of old religious prejudices, and were apt to

enjoy this luxury at the expense of propriety, and occasionally met with a rebuff:—

“ I never shall forget that one evening, at supper, in the house of a young nobleman, a little abbé, dressed out like a doll, had set himself to divert the company at the expense of the old faith. When he came to speak of hell, which he called his *feu de joie*, an old army officer, the only one of the party that did not laugh, said to him: “Sir,” looking at your uniform, I can plainly see what regiment you belong to: but it appears to me that you are a deserter.” “Sir,” he replied, continuing to smile, “there may be some truth in what you say; but I am not in my corps what you are in yours, a field officer.” “Good!” replied the officer; “that you never should be, for judging by your conduct, you ought to have been hanged long ago.” But few were like this field officer.”—P. 61.

But all power on the part of the Church to resist the spread of infidelity was prostrate. Even the Pope himself had no other course but to bribe Voltaire by actually sending him relics, which he gladly accepted:—

“It is my destiny,” said he, “to buffet Rome, and to make her subservient to my small desires. The experiment of *Mahomet* encourages me. I am making, accordingly, a pretty demand on the holy Father—no less than that of a gift of relics for my church, an indulgence in *articulo mortis*, and, during my lifetime, a capital bull for myself alone, granting me permission to cultivate the earth on holidays without being damned.” In point of fact, a few months after, he writes: “I have received, on one and the same day, relics from the Pope and Madame de Pompadour’s portrait. The relics consist of the hair shirt of St. Francis.”—P. 64.

Well might Voltaire be encouraged to say as follows:—

‘I am tired of hearing them say that but twelve men were required to found their religion; I will clearly show them that no more than one is required for its destruction.’—P. 65.

It was the fashion at this time, M. Bungener says, for the aristocracy to place no faith in nobility. During the time of Louis XIV. inequality of rank was looked on by all classes as the natural state of man, to which all cheerfully submitted; yet it is strange, with the spread of democratic views under Louis XV., to observe the following results:—

‘Towards the close of that reign, while equality was proclaimed on the housetops, access to the higher ranks of the army was closed against the commonalty (*roturiers*) by a more formal *ordonnance* than any that had yet appeared. And even in the ranks of the commonalty, distinctions became more marked than ever. Never had precedence among trades and employments been more strictly observed than after people began to talk of abolishing the corporations—those old aristocracies of the wareroom and the workshop. A lady of high rank wanted a coachman; she found one who seemed likely to suit her. “But,” said he, “before engaging myself, I should like my lady to say to whom my lady gives precedence in the streets.” “To everybody,” she replied. “If others give it me, I take it; if not, I wait my turn.” “In that case,” the man rejoined, “I cannot close with Madame. I never give place to any but princes of the blood.” Mark that this great lord in livery, whose name was Girard, ended with being a red-hot demo-

crat. In 1793, being appointed public accuser, he sent to the scaffold those very aristocrats who were not aristocratical enough, in his opinion, in 1780.'—P. 69.

Two causes are noted by M. Bungener as active stimulants to the progress of these views; first their novelty, and then the extreme caution that was necessary in putting them forward. The press was subjected to severe scrutiny. The freedom enjoyed in England even then was a means of spoiling the interest in views which it was agreeable to publish by stealth:—

'Montesquieu, Voltaire himself, on their arrival in England, found the fruits of English liberty almost too much for their taste. Every morning, on reading the opposition newspapers, they seemed to think that not only the ministry, but the monarchy itself, would be shivered to atoms within four-and-twenty hours. Who, then, could wonder at the effect produced in France by the first echoes, feeble as they were, of that confounding din which had frightened Voltaire on his setting foot on a free soil?'—P. 72.

It is rather a fault of the present day, that public writers have, to exaggerate in order to create any impression; whereas, under a severely scrutinized press, a hidden meaning is imputed to every word; the imagination is tickled and interest excited, where, if all were open, the subject would pass by unheeded.

The same rule is applied to the stage—an important influence in that age, and a ready instrument for propagating new ideas. An instance of this scrutiny we give our readers:—

'In 1768, it was *Ericie, or the Vestal*, by a now forgotten author, Fontenelle, that was to receive its sentence. Approved by the players, it was rejected by the censorship, in consequence of its being, in what it says of vestals, full of allusions to conventual cunning. But reclamations and agitation following, it was sent by the lieutenant of police—to whom does the reader think?—to the archbishop, with a request for his opinion. The archbishop, great in excommunicating comedians, was doubtless prepared to reply that he could not, in any case, approve of a play. Not at all. He appointed a commission, composed of parish priests and doctors. Upon their advice, after a long examination, the piece was anew forbidden. The printing of it was also prohibited. It needs not be said that forthwith it was printed—that the prohibition promoted the sale, and even enhanced its reputation.'—P. 76.

One great power possessed by Voltaire in working a cause was that of sinking opportunities for empty personal display, and using all his efforts to combine men of all opinions into one common body by a secret and cunning influence over their fancies. Hence arose his humiliating flatteries, and his total disregard of truth. Louis XV. is called the 'citizen king:' he is even made a hero for 'arresting, almost alone, the march of an army,' though it is elsewhere admitted that the bridge on which 'the prodigy' took place was mounted with cannon and defended by numerous troops. The same unworthy monarch is

said to have 'deserved well of the human race,' and had the title invented for him of 'well-beloved.' It is wholly an erroneous idea that court flattery, and the connivance at regal immorality, were objects of disgust and attack by the movement party. That party, on the contrary, exceeded all others in such offences:—

'Louis XV.'s mistresses had the *Encyclopédie* at their feet. That advancing wave which respected nothing, paused, with a humble and courteous deference, before adultery enthroned at the fireside of the King of France. History even took alarm when the past might displease the present. In sending to the Duke de Richelieu a copy of the *Age of Louis XIV.*, "I flatter myself," writes Voltaire, "that if the king had time to read this work, he would not be displeased with it. I believe, in particular, that Madame de Pompadour might not disapprove of the manner in which I speak of Mesdames de la Vallière, de Montespan, and de Maintenon." But it was long since Madame de Pompadour could reckon on him. From the very dawn of her power, he had hailed her rise with his most graceful verses; had openly claimed the honour of being her admirer, her knight, her poet.'—P. 93.

There is something almost inhuman in Voltaire's venomous pertinacity in pursuit of his end. Of this same lady it is said:—

'On her dying bed she was soothed with the homage he paid to her.'—P. 93.

Nor did he cease then:—

'The woman, despicable in a very different way, who succeeded her in the royal favour, became in her turn the muse of the Ferney patriarch, reviving, at the mature age of eighty, all the poetical fervour of his early days.'—P. 93.

The wretched old man, in 1773, writes to this mistress of the equally wretched old Louis XV.:—

"M. de Laborde," he continues, "has shown me your portrait. Don't be angry, Madam, at my having used the freedom to give back the two kisses to it.

"To men possessing eyes, you can't say nay,
When homage to your portrait they would pay.
To it alone dare mortals show their love,
The original was made for gods above."—P. 94.

Thus it was not real abuses that were attacked in an open way, but religion and the crown were made to ruin themselves by this fiendish deceiver. Yet Voltaire all this time went to mass and kept his Lent; in 1761 he writes thus:—

'Had I a hundred thousand men, I well know what I would do; but as I have not, I mean to communicate at Easter, and you may call me hypocrite as much as you please.'—P. 96, note.

The death, however, of a philosopher is always Voltaire's crowning triumph:—

"Dubois died swearing; I don't say like a heathen, for the heathen did not swear—but like a madman; yet he died," says Voltaire, "a philosopher."—P. 96.

His persecution of the Christian faith led him not only to satirize all ages and scenes of life among those mortals who were contemporaneous with himself, but it distorted all his views of past history. The Jews were his detestation, because they prepared for the coming of Christ. Moses was his especial dislike; whereas pagans, especially those who had been active persecutors of the Christian faith, always claim his sympathy. Julian the apostate is his great favourite, and all the tyranny and cruelty of the Roman emperors, so far as it touched Christians, find in him a willing apologist. The Mahometans he only half likes, because they believe in Moses; whereas, of all existing nations on the earth, he chiefly commends the Chinese, because their history displays for the greatest length of time a certain amount of civilization, with a total freedom from any connexion with the inspired records which Christians acknowledge. Catherine II. is lauded as the 'soul of the universe,' because she was an infidel; and, after she had murdered her husband, he writes to a friend in the following tone of excusing mildness:—

'You see how she behaves to the French, and you will feel certain that the late gentleman, her husband, will be thought to have been in the wrong by posterity.'—P. 114.

The following suggests ideas which, we hope, are as contrasted with France of the present day, in sentiment, as in the position she occupies in the balance of European power:—

'Does she make war on the Turks—not a paltry village is taken by her troops but he sets himself to sing her praises as the goddess of battles. Dying, he says—he had been dying for seventy years—he leapt out of bed to receive a letter in which she announced to him a victory. He chanted a *Te Deum*, "or rather a *Te Deum*." "This was not," says he, "from a fever of the brain, but from a fever of the heart." But, brain or heart, the anti-christian is always there. Know you wherefore he rejoices at Catherine's successes? Not, you may well believe, that Christ may re-enter Constantinople; but Catherine, victorious on the Bosphorus, will push on, he hopes, to Jerusalem, will recall the Jews, rebuild the ancient temple—and Christ will have lied.'—P. 114.

We cannot follow M. Bungener in his protracted refutation of the assertion, that infidelity was the daughter of the Reformation. One historical correction, however, we must suggest. He considers that English infidelity died out with the Stuarts, and that after their dynasty we may trace a revival of religion. The great age of infidel opinions in England corresponds too much with that of France for this to be a correct statement. The eighteenth century was far from an age of revival in religion; and although we were mercifully rescued from the extremes of France, yet it cannot be questioned that we partook much of the prevailing evil; to such an extent, indeed, that Voltaire, judging

from our literary men of his time, had good reason for claiming England as a great witness to his own infidel views. M. Bungener asks why Voltaire should have so hated Calvin, if he could have traced to him the origin of infidelity. He answers this question himself. It was because Calvin caused the execution of the infidel Servetus. That was Calvin's personal share in the contests of his day, and Voltaire takes his side accordingly, with the martyr of his own opinions.

The disquisition on the drama of the eighteenth century, as illustrating the feelings of the age, contains many very sound criticisms, which are full of general interest. The absence of good comedy is remarked as being the general concomitant of an age devoted to wit.

'And here, it strikes us, we must look for the explanation of a fact which has created much surprise, the inferiority, namely, of comedy in an age when there was so much wit.

'How are we to account for this failure? After all that has been said, a very short answer may suffice. People were ever in pursuit of what was false in sentiment, and comedy essentially requires what is true.'—P. 204.

Wit is here, of course, presumed to be a shallow kind of humour, which rests on artificial and untrue habits of life or tone of mind. Such, no doubt, was the wit of France in the age we are discussing. A mixture of pomposity, falsehood, and the meanest vanity, could produce no real wit in any high sense of the word.

'Hence it is that wit does not suffice for the composition of a good comedy. Let us say, rather, from the moment that wit predominates, it becomes a positive hindrance to success. Comedy requires a profound study of the caprices of the human heart, and wit stops at the surface, where a single glance suffices for its entertainment for better or worse. Comedy wants cheerfulness, wit has nothing but sarcasm. Comedy wants good humour, wit has none. Comedy, notwithstanding the lightness of her outward garb, requires to be written seriously, and wit would think it beneath her if she did not treat comedy with raillery and jests. Grimm goes too far when he says, that "comic poets have been, for the most part, melancholy and serious people;" but he is right when he adds, "M. de Voltaire is too gay, and gay comedy is the only kind of writing in which he has not succeeded. The reason is, that he who laughs and he who causes laughter are two very different persons."

'Thus it was that Voltaire, with more wit than Molière, fell so far short of him. He laughs, but does not make others laugh; I mean with that hearty honest laugh, without which there can be no true success in comedy. He laughs, but one would say that he wants only to divert himself; one is almost tempted to take offence at his railleries, and to side with those whom he means to hit.'—P. 204.

Tragedy, M. Bungener says truly, can best dispense with truth, 'because it raises us too much above the level of our everyday sentiments to make it easy for us to follow it, to test it, step by step, by our own experience.' Tragedy was preferred

by a laughing generation as an artificial exercise of feelings, which are excluded from practical life, yet are instincts of Nature that desire gratification. It was also the means of indulging in an equally unreal love of virtue and good principles of conduct. The stage is often the very opposite to the real life of an age.

' Few, then, were so infatuated as to be altogether blind to the extent to which all the old foundations of morals were shaken; few, very few, really had any faith in the new foundations laid by philosophy. Hence, among the great majority, there was a desire to have their minds set at ease, with respect either to the part they might have taken in the subversion of the former, or to the solidity of the latter.

' Now, they had but two ways of thus re-assuring themselves, one only of which was good—namely, to be virtuous. But this was difficult, and they had little taste for it. There remained the bad method—that of allowing their feelings to be affected at spectacles of virtue; and as few of these occurred in actual life, they must needs go in search of them to the playhouse. A play, then, was all the better the more easily it caused those emotions, and elicited those tears, which were to reconcile people with themselves. " People talk of war. Our gallants greatly desire it, and our ladies are but moderately cast down at the thought. It is a long while since they have tasted the high seasoning of the terrors and the pleasures of a campaign; they want to see how much the absence of their lovers will afflict them." At the theatre, also, the people wanted to see whether, and how, they would find themselves affected.' P. 213.

This contrast between actual life and contemporaneous dramatic tastes, was strangely illustrated during the Revolution itself. During the horrors of that time, when blood and torture were daily and accustomed spectacles, and had ceased to create any feeling of the horrible—when the Grève was never empty—when prisons were full of all refinements of cruelty without exciting the smallest sense of pity—at that very time the theatres represented no spectacles which could shock the most delicate nerves.

' People went to the Grève to look on while human beings were torn with red-hot pincers, broken on the wheel, and quartered; yet every tragic hero who dared to perish otherwise on the stage than by the ancient method of poison, or the old poignard of the classics, was denounced as a bungler, a man unworthy to die in good society. This contradiction, we may remark, was itself inherited from the ancients. At the circus, blood flowed in streams in good earnest; at the theatre, it was not allowed to flow even in a figure.'—P. 217.

The scenes of the English stage at this same time astonished the French. Linquet, in his '*Annales*,' says:—

' In England executions are mere child's-play in comparison with ours; the tragedies are butcheries. . . . Hamlet is the quintessence of all the horrors that the frenzied brain of a lunatic could conceive. . . . The grave-diggers, in the fifth act, dig an actual grave. They toss out on the stage a black earth, precisely of the colour and unctuousness of that found in graveyards. This earth is full of real bones, actual skulls, which the

men lift with their shovels. . . . And all this is well received ; and all present, men, women, girls, sailors, lawyers, merchants, lords, all, in short, are in an ecstasy.'—P. 220.

The rough boldness of Shakspeare would have been ill received by the majestic sovereign, who called out, at the sight of one of the interiors of Teniers : 'Take away—take away these baboons.'

The position of actors in society had long been somewhat anomalous. They were condemned by the Church, and excommunicated. They could not, therefore, be married or receive Christian burial, yet they were treated with great distinction. Molière, long so beloved by Louis XIV., was refused burial by the Archbishop of Paris. Many evasions were resorted to with the connivance of the clergy. The stage was renounced on the eve of matrimony, and forthwith resumed ; while churches, exempt from the Archbishop's jurisdiction, were found in which to have burials celebrated. This state of things remained until the Revolution, without any fundamental relief, though the title of members of the king's household was always granted to those who acted before royalty.

The position of dramatic authors was also exposed to peculiar trials. They were at the mercy of the public for an immediate judgment on their works, which one way or the other was fearfully decisive. The first bringing out of a play was therefore a critical moment for the nerves of the author.

'A play might reach the fifth act without the public having pronounced, without showing symptoms of being prepared to pronounce, and often, in fact, without its having any leaning either for or against the play. But as custom required that, before separating, the spectators should settle its fate, no more was wanted, at that last moment, than any circumstance, however slight—a verse, a word, a nothing—to make the multitude determine one or the other way, so as to overwhelm the author either with condemnation or applause. It was universal suffrage preluding, on the playhouse benches, to those more serious caprices of which it is now giving us the spectacle. The mob became intoxicated with this sovereignty of an evening. It seemed to fear lest its right might not be sufficiently vindicated, if it was not exercised with the suddenness of tyranny.'—P. 307.

Marmontel thus describes such an occasion as happening to himself :—

'In those days the author of a new play had set apart for himself and his friends a small barred box, in the third tier, over the proscenium, the seat in which, I may truly say, was like a bundle of thorns. I repaired to it half an hour before the rise of the curtain, and, till then, preserved sufficient fortitude amid my fears. But at the noise made by the curtain as it rose, my blood froze in my veins. In vain they tried to revive me with *liqueurs* ; I swooned quite away. It was only at the end of the first monologue, at the noise of the plaudits, that I regained my consciousness. From that moment all went on well, and from better to better, until there came the passage in the fourth act with which I had been so threatened.

But as that moment approached, I was seized with such a fit of trembling, that, without exaggeration, my teeth chattered in my mouth. Were the great revolutions that take place in the soul and in the senses, mortal, I should have died from that which took place within me when—at the happy violence done to the spectators by the sublime Clarion in pronouncing the verse: “Go, then, fear nothing,” &c.,—the whole playhouse shook with redoubled applause. Never from a more sensible fear did one pass to so sudden and sensible a joy; and, during all that remained of the play, this latter feeling agitated my heart and soul with such violence, that I could breathe only in sobs.’—Pp. 307, 308.

One author we are told of, who experienced a sudden condemnation of his play, and who in his excitement rushed on the stage to assure the assembly that his characters were true to life; and on being laughed at for his explanatory remarks, tossed his hat into the pit, and offered to fight the first man who took it up.

Voltaire never agitated himself in this way. He was of a calmer temperament, and accepted the verdict of the public with much good will, even if not favourable. He had indeed the public well at his command, and was not called on to endure much; but still he had sensations of being ‘exposed to the wild beasts,’ though he had the practical sense to accept the decision of these wild beasts as a final verdict, and to set about altering such passages as displeased them. It was indeed his art to feel the opinions of that class whose judgment he regarded, and adapt himself accordingly. He could exercise most influence over them by always taking his station near them, and never, by any extravagant or unpopular sentiments, separating himself from them.

Voltaire has gained very great renown for his indefatigable industry, and for the voluminous amount of his literary productions. Compared with the majority of French writers, his sixty or seventy volumes sound imposing; but as compared, on the other hand, with the mass of work got through by literary men, it certainly appears that Voltaire, in his very long life, and with his great facility of composition, need not have distressed himself. The *habît* or profession, however, of writing was not recognised by many of the old French authors, as we understand it in days of periodical literature, when a man does not rest on his oars after having written one treatise, and repose on the fame of authorship thus easily acquired. The present manner of writing may be too hasty and ill-digested, but instances of the other extreme, such as the following, certainly appear very slow:—

‘We shall not go back to Malherbe, who maintained, that after writing a poem of a hundred lines, one ought to repose for a year. Tallemant’s *Historiettes* give some curious details on the sluggishness of the father of French poetry, or rather of French versification. A friend, who had lost

his wife, asked him to write some verses on this calamity, and by the time they were made, his friend had married again.

'The seventeenth and the eighteenth century saw many authors who never wrote more than a single volume all their lives. The greater number, shall we be told, did well in keeping to that? No doubt; but there were some, too, whom posterity would have been happy to greet with a heavier baggage.

'Look at Boileau. Some have amused themselves with calculating how many lines of verse he wrote. From 1660 to 1670, a little more than two thousand; from 1670 to 1680, a little more than three thousand; from 1680 to 1690, none; from 1690 to 1700, less than a thousand; from 1700 to 1705, eight or nine hundred. This gives a total of seven thousand, spread over forty-five years; being about two days and a half for each line. In his most fertile period (1670 to 1680), you have not a line a day; and when, after ten years' intermission, he begins to rhyme again, we find four days for every line he produced.'—P. 316.

Racine was many years without producing anything; and Crebillon went on announcing a play called 'Catilina' for twenty-two years, till the wits said, 'Quousque tandem, Catilina!' When its author was near eighty, it at length appeared. Nor were the profits of authors exorbitant. Voltaire did not live on literature, for the only pay of any consequence he ever had was for an edition of the 'Henriade' issued in London in 1726. The propagation of infidelity, however, was his stimulus, and he had no occasion to seek for money.

'He had inherited from his father and his brother about two hundred thousand livres, and he possessed, at his death, nearly two hundred thousand livres of income.'—P. 322.

The securities in which this money was invested have before been alluded to.

'Accordingly, until 1754, his whole fortune was in paper securities; like Bias, he could say that he carried all that he had about with him. His portfolio, we are told, presented a prodigious chaos, with his two or three millions of livres in minute parcels, contracts, letters of exchange, acknowledgments of debt, bills of all kinds and all forms. But even he liked to wander in this wilderness of papers. He might well bewail a little the embarrassments which he was continually meeting there, contested claims, lawsuits, small losses and great ones; but just as high-mettled horses need something more than ordinary work for the damping of their fire, so Voltaire needed something over and above literature, for the absorption of a part of that ardour which he could not have thrown entirely into it without going too much beyond what governments could tolerate. With the energy which he threw into nothing more than his quarrel with the President de Brosses about the cutting down of some trees, he would have overwhelmed a score of enemies with a score of satires.

'This, however, was not always the view that he took. "You tell me," he writes one day to D'Argental, "that it is my lawsuits that impoverish my imagination. On the contrary, they throw me into a passion, and that excites me." At this epoch, it is true, his lawsuits had undergone a change. It was now the feudal proprietor of Ferney battling with the clergy of the neighbourhood.'—P. 322.

Voltaire did not seek persecution, or the notoriety and influence which it might give him. He carefully guarded against it, and made himself superior to it. He did not covet the dangerous proximity to authority which a residence at the court would have entailed; he remained at his retreat on the confines of three kingdoms; and by his writings, his correspondence, and liberal hospitality, gained a strange ubiquitous influence, which was more effective to his purpose, more congenial with his natural love of repose, and better suited to his imagined state of health, than the bustle of Versailles. The publication of the scandalous and impure '*La Pucelle*' threatened him with a storm. He had taken great delight in its composition, and it came before the world in a somewhat premature and mutilated form, having in fact been distributed piecemeal among his friends, and come thus into possession of some one who published it with additions. This gave him the opportunity of denying its authorship totally, and professing the greatest indignation, when it was imputed to him.

"The crowning-point of these infamous manœuvres," he wrote to the *Journal Encyclopédique*, "is the publication of a poem intitled *La Pucelle d'Orléans* (The Maid of Orleans). The publisher has the effrontery to attribute this poem to the author of the *Henriade*, of *Zaire*, of *Mérope*, of *Alzire*, of the *Age of Louis XIV.* . . . People dare to attribute to him the dullest, lowest, grossest poem, that could issue from the press. The pen refuses to transcribe the tissue of sottish and abominable obscenities of that work of darkness."—P. 327.

He was exceedingly touchy of any libel, especially of a satirical kind; and he was a singular instance of the common rule, that satirical people are least fond of satire, professing even to be unconscious of their own.

'The most satirical of men protested, on all occasions, that he neither could be nor desired to be satirical. "I have prohibited my mind from being satirical," he says. And elsewhere: "Were I to follow my own taste, I should never speak of satire but to inspire people with a horror for it, and to arm virtue against that dangerous kind of writing. Satire is almost always unjust, and that is its least fault."—P. 329.

The health of Voltaire was a perpetual subject of his thoughts. By nature of a weakly constitution, he always imagined himself failing, and spoke like a dying man when fifty years of work was still before him.

'His ailments—for he had very real ones, and we ought not, because he complained too much, to refuse him all pity—his ailments were all connected with this perpetual excitement. Did the originating cause lie in the mind or in the body? Voltaire himself, especially in his cynical old age, loved to speak only of the machine being out of order; and he is certainly one of those who have expended, as was said, most mind in demonstrating that they were only beasts. Let us do him more honour than he did to himself, and admit at least an equality of influence in the two parts of which he was made up. There was evidently an action and a reaction betwixt the fevers of the body and the great fever of the mind.'—P. 333.

He often received his guests with the remark, 'You find me a dying man.' Yet see what followed.

'Behold the dying man gets out of bed, spends the whole day with them, gives their ears no rest with his babbling about Paris, about the Encyclopædists, about Pompignan, who had dared to attack them in the discourse delivered at his reception—Pompignan, his *bête noire* for the time; for his physician had ordered him, he said, by way of exercise, "to abuse Pompignan for an hour or two every morning!" He dined with them, he supped with them. He regaled them with the songs of M. de l'Ecluse, his host, formerly actor at the *Opéra-Comique*, and then dentist to the King of Poland; and when they thought he must be quite exhausted, and sighing for his bed, behold, he sets himself to recite two new parts of his beloved *Pucelle*, and cannot think of allowing them to retire!'—P. 336.

Voltaire pretended strangely, at the latter part of his life, to be fond of agriculture. He appears to have had a dim vision at times that something was wanting in the philosophy of his age. The love of nature was wholly unknown in France, and he himself had done nothing but encourage its exclusion.

'It was not until he got to the borders of the lake of Geneva, in 1755, that nature began to be something in his regard. Until then he had never seen it; not a single gleam of it had ever been allowed to fall either on his verses or on his prose. A journey to him was a broad highway and a certain number of inns. In Germany, he had never contrived to get beyond complaining of the severity of the climate, and the absence of comfort in the house accommodation. To England he had gone in search of men and books. These he found, but never dreamt of looking for anything else. We do not perceive, at least, that the rich poetical character of British scenery had fixed itself at all in his memory, or that it had left any impression on his heart.'—P. 339.

Once, and only once, he used his poetic talents in praise of nature. The lines are well known, but we repeat the translation here given. The scene is the lake of Geneva:—

'How, on this spot doth all delight the sense
Astonish'd at the scene's magnificence!
See that calm ocean's waves translucent kiss
The flowery margin of those fields of bliss. . .

Lo, what a scene of snow, and glory too,
Those mountain solitudes present to view.
Then let the Roman tyrant's flatterer
In numbers soothing to his patron's ear,
Let Maro, in harmonious Georgic strains,
No longer vaunt his lovely native plains,
And lakes with shores magnificently grand,
Dug out by nature in Italian land.
Mine is the premier lake. Upon its sides
Th' eternal goddess of mankind resides.
Soul of great projects, aim of great desires,
Here freedom dwells. . . .

Thy throne, O Freedom! is established here. . . .
When Friendship calls thee to her calm retreat,
Grace with thy presence her soft grassy seat;
Like thee, she courts abhors, and shuns, like thee,

The world's cabals and its frivolity.
 Twofold the charm that these twin pow'rs endears;
 While the one elevates, the other cheers;
 May both my life inspire, solace and guide!
 Both at my death triumphantly preside!—Pp. 343, 344.

It was with an immense peal of laughter that Paris greeted this poetic enthusiasm about mountains and snow. Voltaire, true to his principles, did not encounter ridicule again. Other things, however, besides the poetry of the age, proved the total absence of sentiment corresponding to what we understand by the love of nature.

‘With their alleys always straight, their geometrical thickets, their trees mercilessly cut into pyramids or spheres, the gardens and the parks of that epoch harmonized with the inspirations of the poets, as well as with the invariably square châteaux that were built on the despised ruins of the old ancestral donjon-towers.’—P. 345.

M. Bungener follows up this last remark with some true and thoughtful criticisms on the connexion which may always be observed between the adoption of Gothic art and the love of nature, and, on the other hand, between the contempt of that style in art and great coldness to all natural beauties.

‘Now, never have art and nature been more strictly united than during the long period of the Middle Ages. We shall not inquire whether the clustered and branching pillars of our cathedrals were meant to simulate the interior of a forest; we speak only of that intimate, profound, unalterable alliance, that had been formed in men’s souls between the love of art and the love of nature. On this subject there is a fine passage in Michelet—a little mystical, perhaps, but which, if better reasoned, would be less true. “Our Norman cathedrals,” says he, “are singularly numerous, beautiful, and varied; their daughters in England are prodigiously rich, delicate, and subtilely elaborated. But mystical genius is more strongly marked, it seems, in the churches of Germany. There was in that country a land well prepared, a soil expressly fitted for producing the flowers of Christ. Nowhere have man and nature, brother and sister, exhibited beneath the Father’s eye a purer or more infantine love. The German soul takes kindly to flowers, to trees, to beautiful hills consecrated to God; and with these it has built miracles of art, as, at the birth-time of the child Jesus, they dress out the Christmas-tree covered over with garlands, ribbons, and girandoles, for the delight of children. It was there that the Middle Ages produced golden souls, who have passed away without being known to fame—ingenuous souls, at once puerile and profound, who had hardly any consciousness of time, who never left the bosom of eternity, letting the world roll past them, without distinguishing in its stormy waves anything but the blue of heaven.”

‘These ingenuous and profound souls—who saw art in nature, nature in art, and God the supreme artist everywhere—were never more rare than in the eighteenth century. Of that mysterious union, of this great fact, which they had read on the front of the stars, and which they wrote on the front of their temples, who was there that then was capable of conceiving the very statement? Could the believers of that time have understood it any better than the unbelievers? There was wanting in all, what constitutes the true sentiment of art—that of nature. ‘If nature has not been

felt, the arts, which merely transform nature, and bring together her scattered rays in order to produce a unique and profound emotion, will become powerless.'—P. 346.

Voltaire had an utter abhorrence for Gothic art, as barbarous. He was for pulling down Notre Dame itself in order to erect a temple 'more worthy of the capital.' St. Paul's Cathedral, in our own metropolis, was an object of peculiar envy; and to express his dislike to Corneille, he adds, after all other abuse he can think of, that 'his pieces resemble fine Gothic churches.'

This severance between art and nature had much to do with all the errors of French philosophy. It was Rousseau's starting-point, in the idea that human nature was good till spoiled by civilisation. Heathen art never at any time recognised the human mind as being the work of God, equally with all nature, animate and inanimate. It was reserved for Christian times to harmonise man's powers of sense, and his intellect, with the world in which he lives, so that it may become his noble privilege and his greatest pleasure to use the talents that are given him in the work of identifying the praises of his Maker with a deep appreciation of those things which God created to be around us, and to administer to our good.

It was the total neglect of such truths as these that made Rousseau say that 'the savage state is the true state of man.' One condition, which he amusingly yet prudently makes, in order that this savage state may be the most desirable one is, that the typical savage 'shall have dined.'

"The savage man," he says, "when he has dined, is at peace with universal nature and the friend of all his fellow-men."—P. 375.

Before dinner the same individual, M. Bungener thinks, would not be so firm a supporter of the rights of others. But Voltaire and Rousseau, whether we look on the former as the enemy of the old religion, or the latter of the old political state of things, both come to the same conclusion in expounding a pure despotism. Rousseau would have a religion, and one not only encouraged by the State, but enforced by it; that is, he would persecute all who exceeded the bounds laid down for them, and he would look on all those who were not included in this system as the outcasts of mankind. Practically, therefore, no man had a profounder contempt for the lower orders than he had; for he saw, plainly enough, that the aristocracy sympathised more with his theories than did the peasants and the poorer classes. In the religious question, Voltaire's view is thus expressed:—

'Voltaire—and it is a trait which would hardly be forgiven him at the present day, but that his friends take care to say nothing about it—Voltaire teaches, in many places, that the enlightenment of the people should not

even be attempted; he even goes so far—and this assuredly, in him, implies the last degree of contempt—as to say that even their conversion to infidelity should not be attempted. In a letter to the King of Prussia, we find him say: “Your Majesty will do an eternal service to the human race by destroying that infamous superstition, I do not say among the *canaille*, who are not worth being enlightened, and for whom all yokes are proper, but among persons of credit, among men who think. . . . It is for you to feed their souls; it is for you to give white bread to the children of the family, and to leave the black bread to the dogs.”—P. 443.

And again—

“We shall soon have new heavens and a new earth,” he writes to D’Alembert—“I mean for people of credit; for as for the *canaille*, the stupidest heaven and the stupidest earth are all that they require.”—P. 444.

But small liberty would exist under such principles. It is an ideal *man* which the philosophers alone considered; they cared not for men. What greater despotism, then, can there be, than the upholding of a self-conceived ideal which all must copy, or be excluded from every civil right; nay, from the right itself to live; for the Revolution afterwards developed these principles even to this fatal excess.

We have not space, however, to follow M. Bungener through all his political examinations of French philosophy. He warns France of modern times to profit by the lesson of the last century. In the principles of very many of that school, he traces the one conclusion, that the ideal liberty there taught is nothing but despotism.

England has cause to be thankful that the infidelity of last century was not allowed to arrive at the same climax, or bring down the same judgments; but although checked, enough has lingered on to prove the narrowness of our escape. The book before us plainly identifies much that has been said by politicians, within our own memory, with the philosophy of the eighteenth century. That view of religious liberty which only energizes by persecuting earnest partisans in the cause of the Church, and which seems always well disposed to accept the State as the fit and proper government for a national religion, is all very congenial in its character with the sentiments of Rousseau. There have also been followers of Voltaire, both in literary and political circles, who have united with every wave of discontent that may have agitated the country, and striven to make men sceptics. But the difference, as regards success, is remarkable. In England these principles have never spread sufficiently, even in the class from which they took their origin, to bring about any great or overwhelming catastrophe. In France, the case has unfortunately been the reverse. Yet, to the nations at large, we trust that now there is not so great a difference between the two as history might lead

one to expect. In both countries there is now a revival of religion, and a longing for peaceful union among civilized nations. The history of a class has not proved in France to be the history of a nation, though all may for a time have suffered. There is a reverence for religion in the French people which has surmounted the waves of infidelity, and made her again Christian, in spite of the storms that have passed over her. May France and our own country be henceforth as well agreed in the general advancement of religion, and of all peaceful works—whether in art, literature or industry, as now they are united in the cause of justice and national freedom, against tyranny and oppression.

- ART. VI.—1. *Memoirs of the Wesley Family; collected from original Documents.* By ADAM CLARKE, LL.D. F.A.S. Second Edition. 2 vols. London: Tegg. 1843.
2. *An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in the City of London, &c.* By JOSIAH WOODWARD, D.D. Sixth Edition. London. 1744.
3. *The Pious Communicant, &c., with Appendix relating to our Religious Societies.* By SAMUEL WESLEY, M.A., Rector of Epworth, in the Diocese of Lincoln. London. 1700.
4. *Some Account of the Societies for Reformation of Manners, &c.* London. 1699.
5. *Sermons by ANTHONY HORNECK, D.D., late Preacher at the Savoy. To which is added, The Life of the Author, by RICHARD (KIDDER), Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.* Vol. I. London. 1706.
6. *The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies in London, Bristol, &c.* 1739. Works of Rev. John Wesley, Vol. VIII. London. 1830.
7. *Rules of the Band Societies.* 1738. Ibid.

It is not among the least remarkable proofs of the amazing influence obtained by John Wesley over the minds of his followers and adherents, that such a man as Adam Clarke should have employed himself in collecting the history of the several members of the Wesley family, fondly tracing the possible origin of the name to an Arabic or Spanish source, and pointing out the meaning in Arabic, as that of *Father of Union*, or *Uniting Father*. We do not propose to investigate this part of his subject. But there is one fact connected with the establishment of Wesley's system which we believe to have been hitherto almost wholly overlooked or disregarded, and to which we desire to call attention, on account of its important bearing on our own times, and on the present wants and necessities of our Church. It appears that Samuel Wesley, the father, successively Rector of South Ormsby¹ and of Epworth in Lincolnshire, and Convo-

¹ Dr. Clarke has fallen into repeated mistakes about the connexion of Samuel Wesley with this place, for want of consulting the Bishop's Register. He tells a story, p. 107, related by John Wesley, of his father's first living having been given him by a nobleman who kept a mistress, and that this person *would* visit his wife, which he prevented; and having guessed this nobleman to have been the Marquis of Normanby (Sheffield, afterwards Duke of Buckingham), whose chaplain he afterwards was, he refers to this matter again as proved at pages 192, 204, and 205;

cation Proctor for that diocese, a man of letters and of eminent piety, was one of the promoters of those *Religious Societies* in the Church of England, of which account was published by Dr. Woodward, and of which Bishop Kidder, in his *Life of Dr. Horneck*, gave some further particulars. Our object will be to trace the connexion which we believe to have existed between these Societies, and that which Charles Wesley, first, and then his brother John, established at Oxford, and which was undoubtedly the germ of modern Methodism. In doing this, it will be necessary first to give some account of these Societies themselves, and this the rather as some of their most abiding results still remain to the Church of England, in the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for the Propagation of the Gospel, as well as in the great efforts for the education of the poor, carried on by the former of these two Societies for a century before the institution of the National Society.

In Robert Nelson's 'Address to Persons of Quality,' published in 1715, we find the Religious Societies spoken of in the following terms:—

'If a few persons, on no account considerable, and whose names are hardly known, being of the Church of England, by their frequently meeting together to pray, sing psalms, and read the Holy Scriptures, and to edify one another by their religious conferences, have, through their united endeavours and the grace of God, been enabled to do so much as they have done; and to propagate and form themselves into such societies as those that are called *religious societies* have been able to do; if they have been so instrumental in promoting the daily service among churches, with the regular administration of the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ every Lord's-day, and in some churches also every holyday in the year; as well as other excellent designs conformable to the practice of the primitive days and to the established constitution of this best reformed Church; and have contributed more than a little, while under the direction of their spiritual superiors, to revive the true spirit of Christianity by their charities and devotions: how much more easy would it be for persons of quality,' &c. And again, 'Some of the methods which have been taken for this end, have been the setting up several societies and funds for the more frequent and devout attendance on the divine service; for the religious observance of fasts and festivals by authority appointed; for the more exact conformity to the rules of the Catholic Church, and of the Church of England in particular; for the suppressing vice and immorality; for promoting true knowledge and piety, and for proselyting to the established doctrine and constitution such as have erred and gone astray from it, for want of due information and instruction.'

and this account is followed by Archdeacon Stonehouse in his *History of the Isle of Axholme*, where Epworth is situated. But it appears from the Bishop's Register that he was instituted to South Ormsby, June 25, 1690, on the presentation of a private family, who were then, as now, the patrons. The fact is that the house belonging to this family was rented during the minority of the owner by another nobleman, Lord Castleton, some of whose family were connected with that of the patron; so that nothing is more natural than that he should have obtained the living for Wesley, though he did not present him.

¹ Address to Persons of Quality and Estate, pp. 137—139.

The same excellent person had before said, in the preface to his '*Fasts and Festivals*,' which was first published in 1703:—

'Upon this occasion, I think it a great piece of justice to acknowledge and commend the pious and devout practices of the religious societies; who in this point, as well as in many others, distinguish themselves by their regular conformity and obedience to the laws of the Church; for they constantly attend the public assemblies upon such holy seasons. And till they can communicate regularly in their own parish churches upon such days, they embrace those opportunities that are provided, there being two churches in London employed for that purpose, where they as duly receive the Blessed Sacrament upon all festivals as they perform all the other acts of public worship. How they spend the vigils in preparing their minds for a due celebration of the ensuing solemnity is more private, but not less commendable. And the great care they take to suppress the dawns of enthusiasm, and to discountenance the first appearances of any vicious practices among their members, and the methods they impose before delinquents are entirely reconciled or totally rejected, is such a preparation of the minds of the laity for the reception of that discipline which is wanted in the Church, that if ever we are blessed with what good men wish and bad men fear, these religious societies will be very instrumental in introducing it, by that happy regulation which prevails among them. And while they pay that deference they profess to their parochial ministers, and are ready to be governed by their directions, and are willing to submit their rules and orders to the judgment of the Reverend the Clergy; I cannot apprehend but that they must be very serviceable to the interest of religion, and may contribute very much to revive that true spirit of Christianity which was so much the glory of the primitive times.'¹

The '*Societies for Reformation of Manners*' appear to have been first established about 1691,² and to have consisted in great part, though not entirely, of the same persons as the Religious Societies, for the latter were confined to members of the Church of England, which the others were not.³ Their object was to put down that amount of vice and immorality which had prevailed since the Restoration, by public prosecutions and similar methods; and Queen Mary's Letter to the Justices of Middlesex in that year, as well as King William's Proclamation against Immorality and Profaneness, in 1697, were procured by their means. The Religious Societies had been some years in existence, when those for Reformation were established, as an auxiliary and result of the others. But in the account of them published in 1699, we find the following statement relating to the earlier institutions:—

'Besides those before mentioned (the Societies for Reformation), there are about *nine-and-thirty religious societies* of another kind in and about London and Westminster, which are propagated into other parts of the nation, as Nottingham, Gloucester, &c., and even into Ireland, where they have

¹ *Fasts and Festivals*, Pref. p. viii. &c.

² Account of the Societies for Reformation of Manners, p. 115.

³ Latterly, however, the Dissenters began to set up a few religious societies after the pattern of those of the Church, but they were always distinct from one another.

been for some months since spreading in divers towns and cities of that kingdom; as Kilkenny, Drogheda, Manouth, &c., especially in Dublin, where there are about ten of these societies, which are promoted by the bishops and inferior clergy there. These persons meet often to pray, sing psalms, and read the Holy Scriptures together, and to reprove, exhort, and edify one another by their religious conferences. They moreover carry on at their meetings designs of charity of different kinds, such as relieving the wants of poor housekeepers, maintaining their children at school, setting of prisoners at liberty, supporting of lectures and daily prayers in our churches. These are the societies which our late gracious queen, as the learned bishop that hath writ her life tells us, took so great satisfaction in, that she inquired often and much about them, and was glad they went on and prevailed; which, thanks be to God, they continued to do; as the Rev. Mr. Woodward, who hath obliged the world with a very particular account of the rise and progress of them, hath lately acquainted us. And these likewise are societies that have proved so exceedingly serviceable in the work of reformation, that they may be reckoned a chief support to it, as our late great primate Archbishop Tillotson declared, upon several occasions, after he had examined their orders, and inquired into their lives, *that he thought they were to the Church of England.*¹

It appears from Dr. Woodward's account to have been about 1666,² that several young men of the Church of England in London and Westminster, being brought to very serious convictions by the preaching of several of the Clergy, and frequently applying to their respective ministers for religious counsel and advice, were advised by them to meet together once a week, 'and apply themselves to good discourse, and things wherein they might edify one another.' And he adds, that 'for the better regulation of their meetings, several Rules and Orders were prescribed them, being such as seemed most proper to effect the end proposed.' They made collections, at these meetings, for the poor, which they employed partly in putting out poor children to trades, partly in releasing prisoners (that truly evangelical and most blessed act of charity, which seems now to be so little thought of), and in maintaining poor scholars at the university. But it was not until about the year 1678 that they began to digest their rules into a formal system, and it was in this year that two stewards were appointed by each Society to manage their pecuniary and other affairs, and to preside in their meetings when no clergyman was present.

In the beginning of the reign of James II., when some of their members deserted them through fear, the remainder set up, at their own expense, public prayers every evening at

¹ Account of Societies for Reformation, p. 15. The author of this book could not be Dr. Woodward, as he thus mentions him, and besides, he writes as a layman. He is thus referred to by Robert Nelson in his 'Address to Persons of Quality':—'Writ with great seriousness and judgment by a worthy gentleman who is eminent in doing good.'—P. 167.

² His first edition was published in or about 1698, and he says it was thirty-two years ago. But this is quoted from a later edition, in which the date, thirty-two years, may possibly have been altered.

S. Clement Danes, at eight o'clock, and a monthly evening lecture on subjects connected with the Holy Eucharist, which was preached by some of those eminent divines whom James endeavoured in vain to induce the bishops to silence. After the Revolution they continued to flourish, and some objections having been made, as was naturally to be expected, to their proceedings, the Bishop of London (Compton) investigated the matter, and was so thoroughly satisfied that he 'dismissed them, with these words: "God forbid that I should be against such excellent designs."' Others of their chief supporters were 'the Bishop of Gloucester,' Dr. Horneck, and Dr. Jekyl. The Bishop of Gloucester, who was consecrated into the place of the non-juror Bishop Frampton, was Dr. Edward Fowler, who had refused to conform to the Liturgy at the Restoration, but had subsequently changed his mind. But it is possible that the person here intended may have been Richard Willis, Dean of Lincoln, one of the founders of the Gospel Propagation Society, who was made Bishop of Gloucester in 1714.¹ Besides these, there is evidence that these Societies were approved and promoted both by Beveridge, Tillotson, and Stillingfleet.

It was about the year 1691, as before mentioned, that the Societies for Reformation of Manners were founded by the same persons who had before associated for strictly religious purposes. And of these Dr. Woodward records the existence of no less than twenty Associations in London and Westminster at the time he wrote, in addition to forty Religious Societies. He appears to attribute to the impulse thus given to religion, the formation of the Christian Knowledge and Gospel Propagation Societies.² He says that the members subscribed

'one hundred pounds towards Dr. Bray's pious intentions of improving the knowledge and practice of the Gospel in our plantations;'³ and that 'they have been eminently instrumental in setting up about an hundred schools in this city and suburbs, for the instruction of poor children, wherein some thousands of them are now taught freely, and carefully catechised, and educated in good manners and behaviour: many of them are clothed, and in due time placed out to good trades by the same charity.'⁴

Here, then, we seem to have the origin of that admirable system of charity-schools in the Metropolis and elsewhere, carried on by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for a century before the institution of the National Society. And we cannot help remarking on the hard usage often dealt to the Church of England, both in regard to her missions and her educational labours, by those who judge only from the operations of her more recent Societies. It is as certain as any fact in

¹ The edition from which we quote is dated in 1744.

² Pp. 73, 74.

³ Page 98.

⁴ *Ibid.*

history, that the main design of the founders of the Propagation Society was the conversion of the heathen; yet it is sometimes assumed that the Church made no effort in that cause until the present century. It is equally certain that many thousands of poor children were educated in the schools of the Christian Knowledge Society throughout the whole of the last century, of which fact no notice whatever seems now to be taken.¹

The success of these endeavours was such, that the Clergy and others were induced to promote similar associations in various parts of the country. A clergyman writes to Dr. Woodward, informing him of the great advantage derived from such an attempt in reforming the manners of his parishioners at Old Romney, in Kent.² In connexion with the same movement, monthly meetings of the Clergy themselves were promoted for religious conference, the success of which is particularly mentioned in the counties of Bedford, Nottingham, and Lincoln.³ In the latter county, the Clergy and others were enabled to put down a long-standing abuse of horse-racing, on some Sundays 'after Lammas,' which had resisted previous efforts, 'as a minister informed the writer from the place,'⁴ who may very possibly have been, as we shall see, Samuel Wesley himself. Similar Societies were established also in Ireland, and especially in Dublin, under the sanction of the Archbishop, where there were three hundred persons comprised in ten Societies. At Oxford and Cambridge also, it is mentioned that 'some particular methods, endeavoured by several worthy persons in our Universities, have been very serviceable to religion,' on which the writer adds:—

'And it will always be the prayer of good men, that these ancient and famous nurseries of piety and learning may, by the good discipline and careful conduct of their students, especially those designed for holy orders, ever render themselves renowned in the world. That from them the palaces of princes, the retinue of ambassadors, and the families of noblemen, together with our fleet and foreign factories, may have a continual supply of devout and learned chaplains; and that our parishes, both at home and in our plantations, may thence derive a constant succession of pious and laborious pastors, who may effectually refute error, extirpate vice, recommend piety, and restore the divine honour and authority of our most blessed religion, and that the testimonials of these celebrated seats of learning may everywhere be esteemed as the most sacred credentials of persons of the best characters and accomplishments.'⁵

The first edition of Dr. Woodward's book was translated into German, by Dr. Jablonski, an eminent Lutheran divine,

¹ We have before us the Society's Report for 1773, from which it appears that 49,253 children had been so educated up to that time in London and its suburbs, and that there were then in the schools in London 5,755 children, and in other schools in England and Wales 19,506 boys, and 3,915 girls; in all, 23,421. And this education was not only entirely gratuitous, but many of the children were afterwards apprenticed out to trades.

² P. 53.

³ P. 76.

⁴ P. 20.

⁵ P. 53.

chaplain to the first king of Prussia and tutor to his son, who was employed also in some endeavours, at that time, to reconcile the Lutheran and Calvinist persuasions, and to unite them under an episcopate to be obtained from the English Church.¹ At Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Ratisbon, similar Societies were established, and at Schaffhausen, in Switzerland; and the celebrated M. Jurieu, and Professor Frank of Halle, wrote in their favour.

It is natural to inquire *what became* of all these Societies—how they came to perish from amongst us, so that their very existence should be almost forgotten. But before we attempt to answer this question, it may be desirable to show what was the nature of the religious meetings which they held, and the Rules by which they were bound.

It was one of their special objects to cultivate—

‘The following *ornamental* duties, which are in the sight of God of great price: viz.—

‘i. Christian poverty of spirit, in the sense of their own impurity and imperfection.

‘ii. A disinterested mind, wholly renouncing all carnal ends.

‘iii. Habitual prayer.

‘iv. Unfeigned charity towards all men, especially to their souls.

‘v. Quiet resignation to the providence of God in all events.’

The Rules of the Society at Poplar are given as follows—except that we slightly abridge them in some parts:—

‘i. That the sole design being to promote real holiness of heart and life, it is absolutely necessary that they who enter into it do seriously resolve, by the grace of God, to apply themselves to all means proper to those blessed ends: trusting in the divine power and gracious conduct of the Holy Spirit, through our Lord Jesus Christ, to excite, advance and perfect all good in us.

‘ii. That in order to their being *of one heart and one mind* in this design; every member shall own and manifest himself to be of the Church of England, and frequent the Liturgy, &c. And that they be careful withal to express due Christian charity, candour, and moderation towards all such dissenters as are of good conversation.

‘iii. That the members shall meet together one evening in the week, in order to encourage each other in practical holiness, by discoursing on such subjects as tend thereto; observing the Holy Scriptures as their rule, and praying to God for His grace and blessing. And to this assembly any serious person, known to any of the Society, may be admitted, upon request.

‘iv. That at such meetings they decline all disputes about state affairs, trade and worldly things; and that the whole bent of the discourse be to glorify God and edify one another in love.

‘v. Each person to contribute, in his discretion, every weekly meeting, towards pious and charitable uses—especially for putting poor children to school. The money collected to be kept by two stewards chosen annually or oftener, and disbursed by them with consent of the Society, a register being kept which shall be open to any member's inspection.

‘vi. Any member may recommend any special object of charity, and special contributions shall be made in extraordinary cases.

¹ See Colonial Church Chronicle, vol. v. p. 169.

'vii. Any member absenting himself four meetings successively, without cause assigned, shall be deemed disaffected to the Society.

'viii. The stewards may admit new members, after due inquiry, with consent of a majority; and with the like joint consent they may exclude any member proved guilty of any misbehaviour, after due admonition, unless he gives satisfactory testimony of his repentance and amendment, before the whole Society.

'ix. Recommended to every member to avoid the open scandal of gaming in public-houses, shunning all unnecessary resort to such houses, and wholly avoiding lewd playhouses.

'x. Seriously to endeavour after the practice of the following duties:—
1. To be just in all their dealings, to an exemplary strictness. 2. To pray many times a day. 3. To partake of the Lord's Supper at least once a month. 4. To practise the profoundest meekness and humility. 5. To watch against censuring others. 6. Holy thoughts in all places. 7. Help one another. 8. Tenderness, patience, and compassion. 9. In reading the Bible and hearing sermons, to reflect on *themselves*. 10. Shun all foreseen occasions of evil. 11. Think often on the different estates of the *glorified* and the *damméd*. 12. Examine themselves every night as to good and evil done. 13. Keep a private fast once a month. 14. Mortify the flesh with its affections and lusts. 15. Advance in heavenly-mindedness. 16. Shun spiritual pride. 17. Pray for the whole Society in private prayers. 18. Read pious books often, but especially the Bible. 19. Be mindful of the great obligation of this *special profession of religion*. 20. Shun all moroseness.

'xi. Be ready, considering the sins of the nation, to do their endeavour towards the punishment of public profaneness.

'xii. Promote catechising of the young and ignorant in their respective families, and observe all family religious duties.

'xiii. Majority bind the rest.

'xiv. Orders to be read over four times a-year.

'xv. Every member shall express his assent to these orders, and keep a copy of them.'

The directions for Religious Conference are to the following effect. 'An orthodox and pious minister,' to be chosen, if possible, as 'Director,' without any salary or reward. (It is not said that he shall be, of necessity, the minister of the parish.) When present he shall conduct the prayers, but in his absence one of the stewards, or any other person, may do so.

After a short exhortation to prayer, he begins with the Collect, 'Prevent us, O Lord,' followed by those for the Second Sunday in Advent, and the Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity. Then all rising from prayer and being seated, the Steward (or it is presumed the Director) may read a chapter, as set forth in one of the orders, or a commentary on Holy Scriptures or on the Catechism, giving time for any who choose to make comments on it, and may appoint any one of forty subjects named, to be discussed in the course of the year, for consideration at the next conference. The subjects have reference to relative and moral duties and devotional acts, with texts subjoined to each. The remaining twelve weekly conferences in the year, were to have reference to the Holy Communion.

At the end of the conference was to follow another exhortation

to prayer, followed by the Confession in the Communion Service and the Lord's Prayer. Then the Steward alone was to say the Collect for Ash Wednesday, with that for the day, 'and such other collects in the Common Prayer as may be suitable.' Rising, and saying the Doxology, there was to follow a somewhat lengthy exhortation to the praise of God, and then a Psalm to be sung, the Apostles' Creed recited, after which they were to turn to prayer, beginning with the Collect for Trinity Sunday, with a long prayer for the Society, a general intercession, and a thanksgiving. Another exhortation on the duty of humility, and another Psalm, conclude the exercise; which was to close with the Angels' Hymn and its Preface from the Communion Service, and the Blessing, thus, 'May the grace,' &c.

It is clear, however, that considerable variety was admitted, both in the Rules or Orders of these Societies, and in their religious exercises. This will appear if we compare with the foregoing the following account given us by Bishop Kidder, of the proceedings of those which were under the direction of Dr. Horneck:—

'Certain it is that there were some societies of religious and devout young men, under the Doctor's government and inspection; but whether the Doctor did move these young men at first to enter into such societies, or whether they first applied to him, and he only gave them rules to govern themselves by, I am not able to determine; thus much is certain, that he gave them rules, and they were these that follow:—

'i. That all that entered into such a Society, should enter upon an holy and serious life,

'ii. That no person shall be admitted into this Society till he arrive at the age of sixteen, and hath been first confirmed by the bishop, and solemnly taken on himself his baptismal vow.

'iii. That they choose a minister of the Church of England to direct them.

'iv. That they shall not be allowed, in their meetings, to discourse of any controverted point of divinity.

'v. Neither shall they discourse of the government in Church or State.

'vi. That in their meetings they use no prayers but those of the Church, such as the Litany and Collects, and other prescribed prayers; but still they shall not use any that peculiarly belongs to the minister, as the Absolution.

'vii. That the minister whom they choose, shall direct what practical divinity shall be read at these meetings.

'viii. That they may have liberty, after prayer and reading, to sing a Psalm.

'ix. That after all is done, if there be time left, they may discourse each other about their spiritual concerns; but this shall not be a standing exercise, which any shall be obliged to attend to.

'x. One day in the week to be appointed for the meeting, for such as cannot come on the Lord's-day, and a fine of 3*d.* for unnecessary absence.

'xi. Each to subscribe 6*d.* each time they meet.

'xii. On Whit-Tuesday in each year, two stewards shall be chosen, a moderate dinner provided, and a sermon preached, and the money distributed (charges deducted) to the poor,

- 'xiii. The orders to be inserted in a book
- 'xiv. No member admitted without consent of the minister who presides, and no apprentice to be eligible.
- 'xv. Cases of conscience, if such arise, to be brought before the minister.
- 'xvi. Those who leave the Society, to pay 5s. to the stock.
- 'xvii. Majority to bind the rest.
- 'xviii. The following rules are more especially to be commended to the members of this Society: viz.—To love one another. To speak evil of no man. To wrong no man. To pray, if possible, seven times a day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other. To use themselves to holy thoughts in their coming in and going out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual and temporal.'

The Bishop proceeds to say, that he had himself had occasion to consult a great prelate then living, 1706, probably Tenison, about the establishment of a similar Society, who 'was clearly 'of opinion that the young men were not to be dissuaded, and 'that it was best to take care of them, and secure that zeal 'which they expressed, in the right channel.'

Whether this was not, on the whole, the right conclusion, and whether we are not now reaping the bitter fruits of a contrary decision some years later, is a question of the gravest importance. It is probable that, with our present habits of thought, we shall be disposed to judge this matter, in some degree, according to the opinions we have of the *party* with which the promoters of this scheme may seem to have been connected. But such a judgment would be deceptive, for this reason: Party spirit ran high certainly in those days, perhaps never more so; but it had not yet assumed, at least within the Church, that worst form, of *doctrinal* difference. The questions chiefly agitated were those of ecclesiastical order, and of civil polity as connected with religion—such as the Divine right of kings and bishops; and accordingly, we find many things advocated and enforced with the sanction of such bishops as Tillotson and Tenison, Fuller and Kidder, which would now, alas! be called the extreme of High Church practices. Nor can it be thought that these Societies were confined to any particular party, since it is certain that Beveridge and Stillingfleet were among their promoters,¹ to say nothing of the admirable Dr. Horneck, and Dr. Woodward, as well as Robert Nelson, or of Samuel Wesley, whose name we must next introduce.

Dr. Adam Clarke has given us, at full, a 'Letter concerning the Religious Societies,' written by Samuel Wesley in 1699, and printed, and another Letter from a manuscript of Archbishop Sharpe's on the same subject. The writer of the former, having corrected the error of confounding the Religious Societies with

¹ See Dr. Hook's account of his Life.

those for Reformation of Manners, and explained that the Religious Societies are, by their constitution, wholly confined to members of the Church of England, proceeds to quote Tertullian's description of the way in which the primitive Christians met to exhort one another, to pray and collect alms for the poor, as the best description he can give of these associations. He refers to Dr. Woodward for particulars, and then proceeds thus :—

‘ I know few good men but lament that, after the destruction of monasteries, there were not some societies founded in their stead, but reformed from their errors, and reduced to the primitive standard. . . . It will be owned a desirable thing that we had among us some places wherein those who are religiously disposed might have the liberty, for a time, of a voluntary retirement’ (quoting the instance of Ferrar in Herbert's Life). ‘ But if this should not be practicable, at least generally, by men of trade and business, though never so devout inclinations, I see nothing that could come nearer it than these religious societies. The design of Archbishop Cranmer to have founded so many collegiate churches out of the broken monasteries, to consist of some laity, as well as clergy, seems to have had something in it of the same nature (though in a higher degree) with that of these Christian societies now erected ; . . . but since we were not so happy as to have this accomplished, why may not these societies in some measure supply the want of them? For if they were once erected in the most considerable towns and villages, or, where one was not large enough, out of more neighbouring villages united, they might be able notably to assist the rural deans, where there are any, and in some measure supply their want where there are none. . . . There are many parishes which consist of several thousands, some of myriads of souls: now what one man, or two or three, is sufficient for such a multitude? . . . Those who have but one or two thousand will find their cases heavy enough, especially now they have neither the catechists of the ancients to assist them, nor those clerks which are mentioned in the rubrics, and seem to have been designed for that end, at the Reformation. . . . They would be as so many churchwardens or overseers, or almost deacons under him, caring for the sick and poor, giving him an account of the spiritual estate of themselves and others; persuading parents and sureties to catechise their children, and fitting them for confirmation; discoursing with those who have already left the Church, to bring them back to it, or who are tempted to leave it, in order to preserve them in it; the effect whereof we may guess by the contrary, there being, it is likely, ten who are persuaded to leave the Church by their neighbours, to one who is immediately wrought upon by the dissenting teachers. . . . The Church of Rome owes, perhaps, her very subsistence, at least most of the progress she has made of late years, to those several societies she nourishes in her bosom: why may we not learn from enemies? and what better way than to fight with their own weapons? . . . Nay, it must be owned there have been some devout persons among them, who, by this very method of forming lesser religious societies in towns and villages, as well as the greater cities, have done great things towards the reformation of manners and promoting piety and virtue’ (instancing M. de Renty at Caen, Paris, Toulouse, &c.) . . . ‘ The design of these societies, as I am satisfied by considering the first founder (Woodward?), and the encouragers of them, and their rules as well as practice, is, by no means to gather churches out of churches, to foment new schisms and divisions, and to make heathens of all the rest of their Christian brethren; which

would be as indefensible in itself as dangerous and fatal in its consequences, both to themselves and others: so far are they from this, that they have brought back several to the Church who were divided from it; but their aim is purely and only to promote, in a regular manner, that which is the end of every Christian, the glory of God, included in the welfare and salvation of themselves and their neighbours.'

The writer concludes by recommending also the Societies for Reformation, referring to the Bishop of Gloucester (Fowler)'s defence of them, and quoting some words of the then Archbishop (Tenison) in their favour.¹

Our space forbids any lengthened extracts from Archbishop Sharpe's letter on the opposite side. It is clear that it is not addressed, as Dr. Clarke says some had supposed,² to Samuel Wesley, as it is plainly a reply to some official of the Bishop of Carlisle, who had consulted him on the subject. But it is but fair to extract the following passage:—

'I myself have always been averse to such sort of confederacies or combinations, whether of clergy or others, as are now on foot everywhere, whether they be those called religious societies, or those of a later standing which go under the name of societies for reformation,³ as doubting whether they be legal in themselves, (though, with submission, I think it may bear a dispute whether they come under those conventicles that are forbid in the 12th and 73d canons,) and apprehending likewise that some time or other we may feel ill consequences from them.'⁴

This objection from the Canons was answered by Nelson, as follows:⁵—

'As for those objections which are urged against these societies from some canons of the Church (12th and 73d), they seem to be founded upon a misunderstanding of the sense of those canons, the first whereof was designed against the pernicious opinions of the Anabaptists, and the latter only against such meetings and consultations as tended to the impeaching the doctrine of the Church of England, &c., neither of which consequences can justly be charged upon a body of men who make it a chief qualification in the electing their members, that they be such as own and manifest themselves to be of the Church of England, and frequent the public holy exercises of the same.'

But it will be seen that we are far from advocating, in our day, *such* meetings as those which have been described. And here it may be worth while to advert to an attempt which was made by an individual clergyman, at the very time to which we refer, to alter the public services of the Church at his pleasure, and on his own responsibility alone. He describes himself in his books as 'Mr. Edward Stephens, sometime Barrister-at-Law of the Middle Temple, and since engaged by a very special Divine

¹ Adam Clarke's *Lives of the Wesleys*, vol. i. pp. 144. 145.

² *Ibid.* p. 154.

³ These last were some time after declared illegal by a Court of Justice; and it is not difficult to see that there must be a great difference between such associations and a mere religious society.

⁴ *Lives of the Wesleys*, i. 155.

⁵ *Fasts and Festivals*, Preface, p. xi.

'Providence in the most sacred employment.'¹ And it appears from several parts of his book that he began, in early life, by persuading a clergyman in the country (soon after the Restoration) to have monthly communion, 'which was rarely then any where else in the nation above once or twice, or thrice at most, 'in the year.' Afterwards, in a parish where he was lord of the manor and patron, he got it celebrated weekly; and next, removing to London, persuaded some priests—and among them one who had been ordained, but had joined the dissenters, from whence he had reclaimed him—to attend with him weekly at S. Laurence's; and next, to set up a *daily* celebration in a private house, at which this person, on the ground of his previous orders, officiated in a form altered by Stephens from the English office, on what he conceived the model of the primitive Liturgies. When their chaplain was removed from them, rather than the practice should be lost, he took orders himself, though by whom ordained he does not say; and was allowed the use successively of three different churches in London, at which he daily celebrated the divine mysteries for some considerable time. The last of these churches he mentions as *S. Matthew's*, (Friday Street?) in the heart of the City, and it is perhaps the same as that for the use of which he elsewhere says he was indebted to the Bishop of Gloucester (Fowler, who had been a Non-conformist). Here he continued between two and three years, and had seldom less than thirty communicants daily, and on the Lord's day and Festivals a 'considerable number;' until his numbers falling off, and his proceedings exciting opposition, he gave it up, and retired into the country.

Had this been all, we might have supposed that this well-intentioned man had exhibited a model of primitive doctrine, worthy of respectful consideration, if not of imitation. But it further appears that he was not content with this, without introducing his innovations upon the authorized Communion Office, even into the Church where he officiated; first, by adopting some interpolations and transpositions of his own; and next, by using, with some variations, the service from the Scottish Book. From this he proceeded to other extravagancies; and probably after his retirement, continued to write tracts of the most violent kind, against the Reformation and against the then constituted order of things in Church and State, inveighing especially against Cranmer as the author of all evil in the Church, and disputing the validity of the English Orders. It is

¹ A collection of Tracts and Papers, most of them presented to the Lower House of Convocation. London. 1702. '*Socrates Christianus*' is contained in this volume.

² Second Apology of '*Socrates Christianus*,' p. 4.

singular that he never mentions the Non-jurors, and does not seem to have held any communion with them. He sought communion with the Church in France, and with the Greek Church, but in terms inadmissible by them, refusing to submit to the authority or doctrines of either, but claiming to be received on the general ground of an 'English Catholic.' As for the defect of his authority as an English priest, to attempt such innovations, he pleaded just as Wesley did, that the 'defect in ordinary conveyance was supplied by that which was extraordinary. Is God's hand shortened?' and the like. At this time, he seems to have thought himself called to found a new Sect, or be the originator of a great revival of religion; and it was probably not till afterwards, when his hopes were frustrated, that he indulged in those vehement invectives against everything connected with religion in England, which led to its being reported that he was mad. There is no evidence to support the latter assertion; but there was that want of judgment, or impatience of opposition to his own views, which has so often frustrated the best intentions, and rendered good designs abortive. It appears that, at one time, his daily communion was frequented by the members of one of the religious societies in London, but they quitted him on account of his introducing prayers for the dead into his Communion Office. On this he published a violent letter to one of their members, in which he says, 'It is not I, but you, who have made a separation,' and proceeds to prove the early introduction of such petitions into the Liturgical Offices, without the least reference to the question of an individual priest's restoring them on his own mere will, in opposition to the law of the Church, and without sanction from the bishop.

Another of his schemes was for a Society of Religious Women, to be maintained in common, and to devote themselves to the daily public service of God, and to works of piety and charity, as nurses in hospitals and in similar ways. He speaks also with considerable severity of the poor success Dr. Bray's proposal had as yet met with, hardly having raised three thousand pounds for the Propagation of the Gospel; and with some irony reproaches this 'best reformed Church' with the number of souls she has lost or left to perish. On the whole, we would recommend this rare and curious volume to the perusal of those who may have access to it, as opening a forgotten page in the development of the Church after the Revolution, and affording some ground for sad reflections, and some perhaps for warning.

Pass we on now to the year 1729, and let the scene be at

¹ The copy we have referred to belongs to Sion College; it is a presentation copy, and it is kept in the Archives.

Oxford. Bearing in mind the aspiration of Woodward before referred to, for the establishment of Religious Societies at our Universities, and what do we find? John Wesley, elected Fellow of Lincoln in 1726, ordained Priest in 1728, returns to college from a visit to his father in Lincolnshire in 1729, and finds a Religious Society already established by his brother Charles, Mr. Morgan, and some others. He joins them, and they are hooted for going to weekly communion and other singularities, such especially as visiting the prisoners in the Castle. He writes to his father for advice, who replies, on September 28, 1730:—

‘As to your designs and employments, what can I say less of you than *Valde probo*: and that I have the highest reason to bless God that He has given me two sons together in Oxford to whom He has given grace and courage to turn the war against the world and the devil, which is the best way to answer them. . . . Go on, then, in God’s name, in the path to which your Saviour has directed you, and that track wherein your father has gone before you; for when I was an undergraduate at Oxford, I visited those in the Castle there, and reflect on it with great satisfaction. Walk as prudently as you can, though not fearfully, and my heart and prayers are with you.’

He advises them also to obtain ‘the direction and approbation of their bishop.’ This was at that time Dr. Potter, afterwards archbishop. He had been chaplain to Tillotson, and as he could not but know of that prelate’s approval of the Religious Societies, it was only natural that he should give, as he did, the sanction which was sought.

And now, can there exist a doubt as to the direct connexion between these Religious Societies and those which were established by Wesley and his brother? If it be asked how it came that Wesley himself should not have referred them to this origin, that question may be answered by another. How came it that he never referred to the fact of the establishment of such a society at Oxford by his brother and others before his return, in his absence? Whether he thought such matters unimportant, or whether he indulged an unconscious reluctance to admit a competitor in the great scheme of which he is certainly entitled to be called the founder, the answer to either question is the same. And we venture to think that no reasonable doubt can remain of the connexion which we have thus endeavoured to establish.¹

But clouds were now settling fast upon the Church of England. The violence of party spirit on the one hand, and of arbitrary power on the other, had well-nigh done their work. The good and even great men who, having been trained in other

¹ There is extant among his works a sermon preached by John Wesley before the ‘Reformation’ Societies.

days, were appointed by the government of the Revolution to the highest places, were passing off the scene. But the practice then first introduced, of selecting bishops for political services without consulting the episcopal order, survived the occasion, and was abused accordingly. Convocation was permanently silenced, because it would not tamely endure the promotion of a heretic. And when the Wesleyan movement was becoming dangerous to the Church, the Metropolitan was Dr. Herring, no otherwise famous than for having been translated from York to Canterbury, and for having committed, in regard to Wesley, precisely the same error which had been committed by Leo X. in regard to Luther. For in his published correspondence he has been so unfortunate as to express the opinion that 'Wesley was a man who would make few converts.' How different from Wesley's own estimate of his system, in these winged words addressed to Bishop Gibson,—'All the minister of God asks is, *δὸς ποῦ στῶ καὶ γῆν κινήσω.*'¹ And so that system has been left to work its way, with what results it is more easy now to see, than it is to forecast its eventual tendency.²

The question is, Can nothing now be done to arrest or mitigate the evil? For an evil undoubtedly it is (even though it be true that in some instances piety is thus promoted), that so large a portion of those who ought to constitute the very sinews of the Church should be either wholly alienated from us, or brought into a state of doubtful and precarious connexion. In towns, we fear the alienation is general. In the country it is not as yet so. But here, in those parts where Methodism prevails, the almost universal feeling among the poor is, that to become religious and to join the Wesleyan Societies is the same thing. And the consequence is, that the Church has all the discredit of the lukewarm and the vicious; but from the time that any have become more seriously impressed, they begin to stray after the Classes and the Fellowship meetings, which are so attractive to persons in that state of mind and with that amount of information.

It will be said, 'You must educate them;' and we say the same. But there are few delusions greater than that so common one, that what we now dignify with the name of education will be in itself sufficient when the temptation comes. We labour hard to get some knowledge into the minds of boys, who leave us at twelve years old, before the time that thought has begun to operate. If we keep a few of them some two or three years longer at the

¹ Letter to Bishop of London. Works, vol. viii. p. 494.

² Not that we mean to say for a moment that the rules could be construed to justify or sanction such innovations as were introduced by Wesley. See his Works, vol. viii. pp. 269—272.

Sunday-school, too many of these will show us, as soon as they have the liberty, that they have considered going to church as a part of school work, and quickly leave it off. They go out to service in other parishes where they are not known, are much employed on the Lord's day, and with every passion coming into play, soon leave off even private prayer, and laugh at all that we have taught them to revere. But they have heard much of the corruption of their own nature, and of the necessity of divine grace; and thinking that as yet no such grace is theirs, they give way to their own unbridled passions, believing it to be their inevitable lot, until they shall be 'called.' And then, when this call shall come, the Wesleyan Societies are ready to receive them; and as for going to their Parish Priest to open their grief or ask advice or confess their misery, they have never heard of its being done, and they never think of doing it.

In order to suggest a possible remedy for this state of things, we are enabled here to produce a set of 'Rules for a Church of England Religious Society,' which were drawn up fifteen years ago, and which we are further enabled to state that a late wise and cautious Bishop, who then presided over the diocese in which it was intended to make the experiment, had kindly promised to ratify with his signature. Why the attempt did not then proceed is no further important than as it may be necessary to state, that it depended entirely on private circumstances no way connected with the merits of the attempt itself. We omit a short preface which preceded them, but we give the Rules entire:—

'**RULE I. Members.**—The test of membership shall be, that each person comply with the eighth Rubric at the end of the Office for the Communion, which enjoins, that "every parishioner shall communicate at least three times a-year, of which Easter to be one." [The word Easter being understood to extend to seven days after Easter Sunday, as limited in the Rubric to the proper preface for Easter-day, in the Communion Service.]

'**II. Probationary Members.**—§ 1. After the first establishment of the Society, no person shall be admitted a member who shall not have been proposed by two members, and who shall not have complied with the whole of the rules for the space of one whole year after having been so proposed. But on the first anniversary, persons may be admitted after half a year of probation. Young persons after Confirmation desiring to be members, and being proposed as above, shall in like manner be admitted as probationary members, for the like space of one year. And it is desirable that they be proposed by their sponsors, being members of the Society.

'§ 2. When any probationary member is proposed, the members proposing him or her shall certify to the minister the name of such person, together with their belief that he or she is piously and devoutly disposed, according to the baptismal vow, to lead a godly and a Christian life; and such person coming to the minister before the next Communion, and giving satisfaction to him of his or her fitness to come to the Lord's Table, shall be admitted a probationary member.

'§ 3. Persons who may have ceased to be members, may be re-admitted

as probationary members, in the same way as those who never have been members.

'III. *Holy Communion*.—§ 1. All members shall be bound to comply with the first Rubric before the Office for the Communion, which requires that "so many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate (that is, to the minister) at least some time the day before." But if they are not able to quiet their conscience, the Church exhorts them to open their grief either to their own or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word. [Exhortation in the Communion Service.]

'§ 2. Any member who shall be aware that any other member has transgressed the bounds set down in the second and third Rubric before the Office for the Communion, by any notorious sin, or by doing any wrong to his neighbour, or by living at variance with his neighbour, shall be bound to exhort such person to confess his sin to the minister when he next comes to signify to him his intention to partake of the Holy Communion, and if he refuse or neglect to do so, such member shall himself tell it to the minister, who thus "having knowledge thereof, shall advertise him that he presume not to come to the Lord's Table until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended;" which declaration shall be made to the Society by himself or through the minister. But if he refuse, the minister shall signify to the Society that such person hath not complied with the rules of the Society, by which non-compliance he hath ceased to be a member, and his name shall be struck off the list accordingly. [S. Matt. xviii. 15—17.]

'§ 3. Masters or mistresses of families, being members, shall exhort their household to partake of the Holy Communion, and shall signify to the minister the names of such as are willing to communicate.

'IV. *Holy Baptism*.—§ 1. Members shall in no case procure their children to be baptized at their own houses, "unless upon great and reasonable cause to be approved by the Curate" (that is, the minister). Nor, without like cause, shall they defer the baptism of their children "beyond the first or second Sunday next after their birth, or some holy-day falling between." [See the 1st and 2d Rubrics before the Office for Private Baptism.]

'§ 2. They shall provide for every male child to be baptized two godfathers and one godmother, and for every female child one godfather and two godmothers, *who shall be communicants of the Church*. It is expected that members shall be ready to undertake this charitable office for the children of their neighbours, whether members of the Society or not.

'§ 3. Members, being "parents, masters, or mistresses, shall cause their children and servants to come to the church (or school) at the time appointed, and obediently to hear and be ordered by the Curate," in the Catechism and other instruction which he shall give them. [See Rubric at the end of Church Catechism.]

'V. *Lord's Day*.—§ 1. Members shall stand pledged to keep holy the Lord's day. They shall attend the full services of their parish church, or show cause to the contrary to the satisfaction of the Society. They shall promote the like attendance on the part of their children and servants, and shall employ themselves in training them in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and in other charitable works.

'§ 2. Any member not showing cause for absence from church to the satisfaction of the Society, shall be admonished thereof by the minister, when he next presents himself for the Holy Communion, (but will not, therefore, be excluded from the Lord's Table.) After having been thrice admonished within the year, such person shall cease to be a member of the Society.

‘VI. *Sickness*.—“When any person (being a member) is sick, notice shall be given thereof to the minister of the parish,” that he may receive the consolations of the Church. [See Rubric for the Visitation of the Sick.] If the Lord’s Supper be administered to him, he shall procure the fit number to communicate with, (namely, three, or two at the least.) He shall also ask for the public prayers of the congregation in church, and shall not fail to return public thanks, as well for any other signal mercy, as for recovery from dangerous sickness. Members shall exhort their sick brethren, not being members, to send for their minister, and shall be ready, of their charity, to read to them and instruct them, and, if required, to communicate with them. N.B. Sick persons are to be moved “to make special confession of their sins, if they feel their conscience burdened with any weighty matter.” [Rubric for the Visitation of the Sick.]

‘VII. *Family Prayers*.—Heads of families, being members, shall have family prayers night and morning; or if they go to daily work, yet at the least every night. And their minister shall, at their desire, supply them with a form for that purpose. They shall not omit to pray for a blessing on this Society, on their bishop, and their minister.

‘VIII. *Stewards and Church Collection*.—§ 1. “Upon the first day of the week” (namely, the Lord’s day) “let every member lay by him in store as God hath prospered him” [1 Cor. xvi. 2] some contribution, however small, for sick and poor members, which shall be collected by the stewards after divine service, when there is no church collection.

‘§ 2. Two stewards shall be chosen yearly at the anniversary of the Society. But if the churchwardens of the parish be members, or either of them, he or they shall be stewards by virtue of their office, and then only one other steward shall be chosen, [according to the Rubric, which says that “the alms of the people shall be collected by the churchwardens, or other fit persons.”] They shall be the treasurers of the Society, and the collection shall be administered by them together with the minister, setting apart for missionary purposes such proportion of it as shall be fixed at the anniversary meeting. The benefits of the collection shall not be confined to members.

‘§ 3. The stewards shall also keep a list of members; they shall note on every Lord’s day, after divine service, such members as have not complied with the rules of the Society, and shall signify the same to the minister, who shall adopt the same course in every other case as is provided by Rule V. The members shall assemble for these purposes after divine service, in the vestry or chancel, or other convenient place.

‘IX. *Certificates*.—Any person coming into the parish from any other parish where there is a Church society, and bringing with him a certificate of membership, signed by the minister, shall be at once admitted a full member of this Society, on his signing the Rules. And any member quitting the parish may take with him a certificate to the same effect, or to the effect of his being a communicant of the Church.

‘X. *Anniversary*.—On Whit-Monday or Whit-Tuesday, or on some other Holy-day of the Church, the anniversary of the Society shall be held, when every member shall attend the full service of the Church, morning and afternoon; and shall partake of the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. After service, probationary members shall be admitted to membership: the names of fresh probationary members shall be given in by their sponsors or two other members: the surplus of the collection shall be allotted by vote to missionary purposes, or to the bishop to be distributed by him. Stewards shall be elected, and other business transacted.

‘XI.—This Society shall not be established until the Rules shall have been submitted to the bishop, and approved by him (according to the primitive

injunction "to do nothing apart from the bishop"). Each member shall sign the Rules and keep a copy of them. Nor shall they be altered, except with consent of the bishop, and of two-thirds of the members. If any dispute arise about the Rules, it shall be referred to the bishop, and his award shall be final. The bishop shall have the power, at his pleasure, to dissolve the Society.

'XII. *Church-Membership*.—Forasmuch as it is declared by the Articles of the Church of England, that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance" [Article xix.]; and again, that "the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith" [Article xx.]; it is therefore a fundamental rule of this Society, that it does not seek to form any new association, apart from that "congregation of faithful men," of which the Church consists; and that the members do no more than pledge themselves to observe those things which they are already bound to observe by their Baptism and Christian profession, renewed in Confirmation and in the Supper of the Lord.'

It will be seen that it was not intended under these Rules to hold any devotional meetings except in church. But this is not the only deviation from the design of the original Religious Societies. Those Societies were associations of 'young men' only; and although Dr. Woodward remarks, in reply to objections on that score, that they had existed long enough for some of the members to attain the age of sixty, the principle involved in them was that they should be confined to young men. And if only so much as this were now to be attempted, we believe much good might result.

Perhaps the rule might be that young men should be admitted after confirmation until the age of thirty, after which age they should be 'honorary members,' not being obliged to submit to the calling of their names, but being of course partakers of all the privileges of the Society. As the Rules prescribe nothing which is not already prescribed by the Church, it might be presumed that by that time they would have got the habit of observing those ordinances—and this would be one safeguard against the danger of the Society degenerating into a sect. For the same and for other reasons it might be better not to admit young women at all. Religion has more hold upon the female mind, and if that degree of discipline which the Church prescribes once came to be generally understood, there would be little fear of their gentle nature not falling earnestly into the system adopted by their husbands and brothers.

But on the other hand it is not conceivable that such a Society should flourish without *some sort* of religious meetings. It is provided in the above Rules that the members shall assemble after Divine service in the Vestry or Chancel, when their names shall be called and the collection made. Would it be possible to connect with this the practice of saying *private*

prayers in common at the altar rails, or elsewhere, according to the course so often recommended of late, though hitherto with small success? We remember to have seen many years ago, in the Cathedral at Turin, a number of men of the middle rank in life kneeling together at the rails of a side altar, where no service was going on, no priest being present, and reciting in common a series of prayers in a plain tone. We believe they were the members of one of those charitable fraternities to which, as Samuel Wesley truly said, 'the Church of Rome owes so much.' Whether it might ever be thought fit to allow a number of collects from the Prayer-book to be thus recited in common in our churches, is a question for the rulers of the Church; and what may be the precise intention of the Bishop of Llandaff in the Committee of Convocation appointed on his suggestion, we do not know. But we will suggest another mode, which we think is practicable even now. The bishop has authority to permit the use of the Litany at other times than those prescribed. And that this power is deemed to extend to all hours of the day, and is not limited by the words, 'after morning prayer,' appears from the fact of its having long been the practice at Lambeth to have the Litany in the Archbishop's Chapel, when the Bishops dine with his Grace, and on other public occasions, before they go to dinner. Indeed it is wisely done to construe such permission as widely as the words will bear. We would therefore suggest that the Litany should be used at an evening service; and, if there was a village choir, it might be said or sung in the chancel with the choir. After this a psalm might follow, and then a lecture. After the prayer preceding the lecture, it might be permitted that all should kneel in silence for some minutes, and then join aloud in the Lord's Prayer. We should be inclined to hope that this might supply a sufficient substitute for those exciting prayer-meetings in which it is said that each in turn is permitted to lead the devotions of the rest, according to the impulse of the moment. After the lecture, it would be competent to use any number of the collects in the end of the Office for the Holy Communion, according to the permission of the rubric. Of course it is not intended that these meetings should be confined to those who should form the Society, but be open to all comers, like all other services in church. We believe there is, at least, one instance in London in which the Bishop allows the Litany to be used daily in Holy Week; and in which, with such permission, the following services were tried at that season in the present year: 1, Morning Prayer, early; 2, at the midday office, the seven penitential Psalms, the Litany, the office for the day in the Holy Communion; 3, Evensong, with sermon.

If it should be feared that even so much as this might lead eventually to division and sectarianism, the answer is that sectarianism and division exist already, and that the meetings of those among whom they exist are of a far more questionable kind than these would ever be; so that such proposals are not to be considered as if no such thing existed, but rather as a kind of *ecclesiastical homoeopathy*.

We see and have experienced the way by which those who at least began as the most devoted members of the Church have been led into separation. Does not this fact indicate its own cure? Does it not indicate a want which is not supplied, a craving which is not satisfied, within the pall of our communion? And are we always to go on boasting of our exemption from what we stigmatise as enthusiasm, when the result is, not that enthusiasm is diminished—quite the contrary—but that those deep and often excited feelings which, under proper regulation, might be capable of the best results, are led to find their vent in unauthorized and schismatical courses because they can find no sympathy, or at least no bond of union and fellowship, where they first arise? For it is this that aggravates the evil, that these people are our own people, and that they often receive their first and most abiding religious impressions within the Church.

We hear much of proposals for influencing the masses of our people, and bringing them back to the Church. We have ourselves, in a recent article, suggested the possibility of preaching in the open air, and of a modified and regulated system of itinerancy. But we are satisfied that this will not do alone. Why is it that the preaching of Whitfield has left no abiding results, while that of Wesley has laid the foundation of such a vast and increasing fabric? We know of no other reason than this, that the one preacher combined his followers into a Religious Society, while the other was content with the transient impression on individual minds. And we may learn the same thing from our own Missions among the heathen. Bishop Middleton has left behind him this emphatic declaration in regard to Missions, that ‘the progress of the Gospel in India is ‘opposed by discipline and system; and by discipline and system ‘alone, with the Divine Blessing, can it ever make its way.’ And all experience verifies the correctness of his opinion, so much so that our Missionaries are constrained to have services and meetings which we at home should deem irregular. And yet if their converts are liable to the allurements of their former heathenism, who shall say that the allurements in their case is greater than that to which those are subject, who, in addition to the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil, are

liable to all the enticements of a prevalent, and to them attractive system of religious excitement? We are far from saying that their *danger* is so great, since we desire to speak with all charity of those whose error we believe to be one, for the most part, of the information or judgment rather than of the will. But we think that the masses of our people have less to guard them against schism than our heathen converts have to protect them against relapsing into heathenism.

And here another matter presents itself. We have spoken of Wesleyan Methodism, because it is that which offers the most obvious point of disunion with the Church, being at once the most recent, and having the fewest points of essential difference. But we believe what we are about to mention would extend to all classes of Dissenters. *Are we to go on for ever without any attempt at reconciliation?* No, says the liberal spirit now in vogue — alter your Prayer-book, relax your Articles, strike out all that now offends, and by merging 'minor differences' place the Church of the Nation once more on the broad basis of national acceptance. Alas, too glowing picture, — alas, how hopeless and impracticable! The experiment has before been tried, and failed as it must ever fail, but left behind it a legacy of bitterness from which, now in a century and a half, we have not yet recovered. It was shown by the elder Sherlock, in a tract published by him at the time, in 1689,¹ that the Church neither desired these alterations nor needed them, and that if made for the sake of Dissenters they would not and could not satisfy them, but that, if made, that which they would do would be this, *they would make a schism within the Church.*

What then can be done? We think it would be a right course, and one which would tend to good, and open a way at least towards future reconciliation, if Convocation might be permitted to enter upon communications with the Wesleyan Conference, and with the governing body of other 'denominations,' expressive of the desire on the part of the Church for mutual reconciliation on the ground of mutual forgiveness, and inquiring what concessions could now be made by which they would be satisfied. It is indeed not conceivable that any concessions which we could make would effect an immediate reconciliation with the original Dissenters. Such a dream was shown by Doctor Sherlock to be hopeless at the time of that commission, whose proposals are now to be printed with the sanction of the House of Commons. For their congregations would not join us without their ministers, and their ministers would not

¹ A Letter to a Friend, containing some queries about the new Commission for making alterations in the Liturgy, Canons, &c. of the Church of England.

submit to Episcopal ordination. Nor is it our intention to propose concessions. Everything in the way of charitable and affectionate intercourse—every expression of regret for former differences, which could be made consistently with the maintenance of our own position as the visible Church in England—we would gladly recommend. Above all, we would submit to any amount of self-humiliation and self-accusation, on the ground of our manifold sins. But as regards concessions, we believe there is considerable doubt whether the common report of Archbishop Bramhall's having admitted Presbyterian Ministers to *conditional* ordination is correct. Dr. Hook, in his *Life*, says that he ordained them in the usual form of ordaining laymen, without any hypothesis, and merely inserted a clause in their letters of orders, to certify that he did it to supply defects.

But we think that such overtures, even as regards them, would be graceful and in good taste, and might pave the way for future reconciliation by healing old animosities. They might do more; and that we may be honest as to our intentions, we will not scruple to avow them. We think it not impossible that, in this way, we might by degrees attract many of their body to *submit* to the claims of the Church, and thus allure the best of them into the stream of our influence. We hear that this is what is now being done, to a very great extent, by the Church in America. And in proportion as we show ourselves equal to our own pretensions, and to the greatness of our vocation, why should it not be hoped that the same result may follow among ourselves? And in regard to the Wesleyan body, we think we might hope for more. We have reason to believe that the old yearning after the Church which Wesley longed to serve, is not yet extinct among them, and that a considerable number of their ministers would accept orders from our bishops without any concession on our part. At least it is worth while to make the attempt; and if made in a friendly spirit, and without an attempt, always so fatal, on the part of the State, to coerce us into concessions which we ought not to make, for the sake of its own chimerical and impracticable schemes, it might have some good effect, especially at a time when that body itself is agitated by internal disunion. At all events we think it cannot be denied that some such overture ought to have been made long ago, and if it be now more difficult it is never too late to do right.¹

¹ Having turned to Dr. Hook's *Life of Wesley* in his *Ecclesiastical Biography*, after this was written, and just as we were sending it to the press, we find that he has there ventured even to suggest that the existing system of the Wesleyans should be licensed by the Church, on their agreeing, of course, to a reconciliation. We are happy to refer to this eminent authority in support of the opinions we have expressed.

But that on which we mean chiefly to insist is, that the great cause of increased dissent in modern times is *the want of an organized system of voluntary discipline* within the Church. Whether the means of restoring such a system which we have here ventured to suggest would be effectual or not, we must now leave to others to decide. But if not, we still maintain that we cannot hope to succeed in retaining within our communion the whole body of those whom we educate, or whom we reclaim from ignorance and vice, until we shall have found out some way of supplying to them those incentives to devotion, and that scope and vent to the outpourings of awakened hearts, which we are thankful to believe are indeed now supplied, to some extent, to the educated and intellectual classes, but which require to be extended to all those to whom the Gospel ought to be all in all.

[Since the above was written, we have found it stated in the authorized Life of Wesley by Dr. Cook, that *the Religious Societies in the Church of England received him with open arms*,—a statement which confirms all our surmises on the subject.]¹

¹ 'The Societies for the Reformation of Manners, which received the support of the Government (!), and the *private Societies* formed throughout the kingdom by the zeal and strong recommendation of the pious Doctor *Horneck* and others, undoubtedly gave a check to that dissipation of spirit, that practical Atheism, and that perfect looseness of morals, which had so entirely pervaded the whole land. Many of these Societies remained in being in the year 1738, and received Mr. Wesley with open arms when he entered on his most extensive sphere of action.' —Cook and Moore's Life of Wesley, pp. 6, 7. 1792.

ART. VII.—*Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the existing state of the Corporation of the City of London, and to collect information respecting its Constitution, Order and Government, &c., together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Presented to the Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty.* Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1854; fol. pp. 913.

IN the year 1853 it had become clear that it was impossible any longer to resist a searching inquiry into the affairs of the Corporation of London; and such an inquiry it was evident would result in suggestions for its comprehensive reform. There is nothing either wonderful or blameable in the fact that it had stood unreformed so long; and that great tenderness and consideration were evinced for so many years towards the privileges and administration of the Corporation. It is, perhaps, a more legitimate subject of surprise that the issuing of the commission of inquiry excited so little opposition, and that the recommendations of the commissioners, important and sweeping as they are in their character and scope, should have occasioned so little unfavourable comment.

For, in truth, the ancient history of the Corporation is one which, upon the whole, may be regarded with justifiable pride and satisfaction. Its present immense wealth, and consequent political power, are the legitimate results of an early history, creditable to themselves, and to the national institutions and character, of which they were a chief production and example. Wealth has brought with it corruption; exclusiveness and selfish policy have naturally engendered weakness; and the existing Corporation of London has become the reproach of this practical and economical country, and has been the object of obloquy, perhaps a little exaggerated, and of attacks certainly somewhat ill-directed. The history, however, for many centuries of corporate cities in general, and emphatically that of London itself, is by no means a subject for either obloquy or attack. They were the sole homes of freedom in Europe, the only places of refuge from the tyranny and oppression of the sovereign and his armed nobility. Great and wise kings, in almost every European country, seem to have felt the absolute necessity of creating and protecting the liberties of these incorporated towns; perhaps as some mitigation of feudal rigours, possibly also from the selfish yet politic desire of finding some support for them-

selves against the overwhelming power which the barons could exert even in England if united, and which in foreign countries was often possessed by a single great feudatory. It is likely enough that on the part of the cities, privileges were often extorted from very mixed motives, and that it was but seldom that an enlightened policy or a wise prescience dictated demands which, in their result, turned out highly valuable and salutary to the community at large. Still, happily, the instincts of the cities were generally to be trusted; even if these anti-feudal and anti-baronial feelings may have been carried in some cases to excess, it was the right feeling for the times, its encouragement was the encouragement of art, and commerce, and education, and independence; it was the spirit which has made England one of the greatest empires of which history takes note, and certainly the freest country in the world. We can understand, perhaps sympathise with, the indignation of a baron who had lost his Gurth or Wamba, and who found that he had fled, very likely had been enticed, into the City of London, had been concealed there for a year and a day, and had now become a free citizen, entitled to snap his fingers at his lord. But this was one of the ways through which feudal slavery was first mitigated, and gradually disappeared; and no one who reads the middle age Chroniclers will be apt to think hardly of any means, however indirect, which raised the value of the lower classes in the eyes of their superiors, or pointed out to the serfs and vassals a way for their escape from under those iron footsteps which trod them heedlessly into the dust, and crushed their very lives out with contemptuous disregard. There is nothing so painful in perusing records of the 'age of chivalry,' as the utter scorn and cruel selfishness of the gentlemen of those days towards all below, or out of the pale of their own chosen class. The sneers of Horace, and the remorseless exterminations of Sulla, are hardly more indefensible in principle than the tone in which Froissart records the massacre of a multitude of common people, or the defeat and death of Philip van Artevelde.

Against this spirit it was a matter of course that the City of London should struggle; and it had power, as far as its own interests were concerned, to struggle successfully. Even before the Norman conquest, London had asserted its independence, and its right to be governed internally by its own laws; and was certainly not at that time, nor for some time previously, *in demesne* like so many other cities. The citizens obtained from the respect or fear of the Conqueror, who might have heard of their inflexible and successful resistance to the great Canute, brief but pregnant charters, which in effect confirmed them in the enjoyment of all their essential privileges; exempting them in

particular from the hated jurisdiction of the king's justiciars, who were imposed upon the rest of the kingdom as foreign judges, administering an alien system of justice in a language which the people did not understand. In the time of Stephen, and again in the reign of John, they contended with vigour and success against the harsh despotism of the Empress Matilda, and the meaner tyranny of the king; and although they suffered often and greatly during the long and troubled reign of Henry III., their power and splendour on the whole greatly increased, and at the same time their authority in the country (sufficient more than once to decide the issue of a civil war), and their determination to maintain their freedom. They even ventured into conflict with so great a sovereign as Edward I.; and although they had sometimes to buy their privileges of him at a heavy rate, they did buy them, and boldly defied the king when he attempted to invade them. In the time of Richard II. the feeling of the citizens for freedom, but for freedom regulated by law, was notably displayed. They resisted Wat Tyler and his 100,000 men, and the lord mayor killed him: but they could not tolerate the wanton oppressions of the king; and their hearty adhesion to the cause of Henry IV. seated the house of Lancaster on the throne. They uniformly supported this politic king in his contests with his barons; on one occasion almost alone defeating a powerful combination of the discontented nobility. The wars of the Roses afforded many opportunities, not neglected by the citizens of London, for increasing their own privileges; and as they had been found on the side of Henry IV. against Richard II., so on the other hand they were steadily in favour of the house of York, throughout all the contests of the reign of Henry VI. Thrice did Edward IV. owe his crown to the citizens of London. He repaid them with lavish grants, with genial and steady patronage. Their support deserved his gratitude, and although, as we have suggested, it is likely enough that selfish motives mingled with nobler ones in directing their policy, so it was, that the kings who trusted most to their parliaments, appealed most to their people, curbed most vigorously the turbulence of their barons, met with the firmest and most powerful support at their hands.

An imperious and high-handed race of kings followed upon the brief usurpation of Richard III., who himself almost professed to base his claims to the crown upon an election by the city. Under the Tudors, the City of London, like the rest of England, abated somewhat of its free and haughty spirit. Yet glimpses of the old temper flashed forth from time to time. The city withstood Wolsey and Henry VIII., and absolutely refused to comply with an illegal tax; and Mary owed the complete defeat

of Sir Thomas Wyatt's insurrection to the loyalty and courage of the citizens. Elizabeth treated the city like the rest of her subjects; if she somewhat strained her authority, her people submitted to it in general because they knew that it was not for selfish or unworthy ends; but when once she attempted to take into her own hands the appointment of the Recorder, she yielded gracefully to a respectful remonstrance from the Corporation. Her successor cultivated sedulously the good graces of the citizens, and granted them important and valuable charters.

But it was in the next generation that the immense importance to which London had grown was most fully seen, and that the Corporation acquired their noblest title to the gratitude of posterity. None of the adversaries of Charles I. pursued upon the whole a more honourable and blameless course. The dignity and beauty of Charles's own character were not unappreciated by them, and personally he never received anything but respectful and even cordial treatment at their hands. But they were inflexibly opposed to his attempts to govern without his parliament; they resisted his arbitrary measures with firmness, but with temper; and in their famous protection of the five members, whom the king wished to arrest, and who fled for refuge to the city, they took the strongest and most important step which had then been taken in defiance of his power. They were unmoved by his personal menaces and persuasions; yet they kept within the law; and neither the king himself, nor the king's party, appear ever to have impugned their motives, or accused them of conduct either contumacious or insulting. Their steady maintenance of the cause of the Parliament is agreed by all historians of the time to have been one main reason for its success; their troops were amongst the best in the armies of the Parliament; their money contributions amongst the largest and most frequent which the Parliament received. Nor must we forget, whatever we may think of the means which the Parliament employed, that the result of their struggle, after the short despotism of Cromwell, was to settle the question of English freedom; and to make it impossible for us ever to be enslaved without being first corrupted and debased. In this great struggle the city bore a leading part; but it lent no countenance to the extreme measures of Cromwell, and so far as it could, resisted his supremacy. With this stormy period the national importance of the City of London ceases all at once. The subsequent hostilities between the capital and the government under Charles II. and James II., although no doubt they excited great attention, and probably added considerably to the national discontent, belong to another order of things, when the city was losing its relative weight and influence, and

becoming merely one great mercantile community amongst a powerful and increasing people. And since that time it has sunk very rapidly in estimation and respect; and if it wielded any great political influence now, it is that only which any man, or any set of men, may just as well exercise, who do not scruple to employ the power of an enormous revenue, in all ways, direct and indirect, for maintaining and extending it.

It will be seen hereafter that we have no desire to become the apologists of the city, or to see them protected in the enjoyment of powers which they have abused, and privileges of which they are utterly unworthy. But before we wonder at, or blame our ancestors for conceding to the Corporation rights which time has shown to be unwise, it is only fair to recollect that the city of their day, and the city of ours, are two wholly different things; and that a commerce and population has grown up in England, and especially round the boundaries of the city, of which our forefathers could never in their wildest dreams have arrived at any adequate conception. A king who owed his crown or his security to the great Corporation, might neither unwisely nor ungracefully concede to them enormous privileges. A people who acquiesced in his sway, at any rate a large and victorious party in the country, would not be disposed to grudge the price paid for success, or very jealously to scrutinise the present wisdom or possible future policy of grants, which had either secured their own victory, or effectually consummated their opponents' defeat. Moreover, when London stood comparatively alone as the representative of the trade of England, a great many advantages were rightly and fairly conceded, for which now there could be neither reason nor defence. And thus it has happened that a body whose existence is perpetual, although its character has changed, meets the angry scrutiny of these times, clothed with privileges and wielding powers of which it is the very unfitting possessor, but which were possibly in their origin the legitimate adjuncts of a position, which has been long since relinquished or destroyed.

It is not easy to point out the definite period at which the character of the Corporation began to alter; and from which, although its legal powers may have remained, its substantial influence and authority in the state began to decay. The sources and the nature of the change alike prevent the stages of it from being marked by clear and distinct symptoms. Even before the civil wars in the time of Charles I. there are indications, neither few nor obscure, that the vulgar civic character was already growing up, and that contempt and dislike were mingling with the feelings entertained towards the city by the general mass of English society. The dramatic writers of the

times of Elizabeth, James, and Charles—Middleton, Heywood, Massinger, Shirley, and others—are full of passages, showing that arrogant pride of purse, together with a mean subserviency to men of rank, and a desire to purchase by wealth admission to the society and families of noblemen and courtiers, were supposed to be un-failing marks of the civic character. No doubt, for the sake of humour and effect, these failings were often represented by the dramatist in an extreme and exaggerated form; yet the satire could hardly have been applied if there was no cause for it, nor would writers, entirely dependent upon popular applause, have ventured to run counter to the popular feeling and belief. The reign of Charles II. was not very likely to raise the tone or credit of the city; and the fact that, since his time, dramatic satire has been levelled elsewhere, may show no more than that it is not worth while to be attacking a body, whose social and political importance has so greatly declined.

In truth, the gradual growth of the metropolis has been fatal to the pretensions of the city. Outside the city walls a vast community has sprung up, even separate portions of which greatly exceed the city in wealth, importance, and the rank and power of their inhabitants. It would be a curious inquiry, and would lead to very interesting results, to trace the growth of the metropolis, and the absorption within the bounds of one vast city of its various component and originally distinct portions. For our present purpose it is enough to say that when the judges breakfasted at the village of Charing in their way to Westminster, when noblemen's villas and their stately gardens lay all along the Strand, when Moorfields was a swamp, and Bethnal-green a meadow, and snipes could be shot in S. Martin's-lane, and Paddington was a distant village, the relations of the city to all these places, and to the country at large, must have been wholly different from those which exist at present. The city and the metropolis of England were then substantially the same. But the city did not see the absolute necessity, or were unable to conceive the practical wisdom, of maintaining the existence of the same state of things. They did not foresee that privileges conceded for good reasons at one time might become untenable if the reasons ceased to exist at another. At any rate so it was, that never, all through the history of the Corporation, does there appear to have been the slightest inclination to enlarge the boundaries of the city, to increase the area of the benefits of civic privileges, to constitute themselves representatives and benefactors of the whole metropolis, or to gather round the city, as a natural centre, and connect with it, as integral portions, the gradually widening and multiplying districts which lie beyond the boundaries.

It is true that, as in the case of Southwark, (the connexion of which with the city is now little more than nominal, and has never been effective or beneficial,) the situation of the metropolitan districts within the counties of Middlesex, Kent, and Surrey would have rendered necessary the interposition of Parliament, from time to time, to prevent the conflict of jurisdictions, and to place them effectively within the full benefits of the jurisdictions and privileges belonging to London proper. The city, as our readers are aware, is a county in itself, and entirely separate from Middlesex; whereas Southwark never has been, and could not be, taken out of Surrey, except by Act of Parliament: a king's charter could not, in historic times, alter the boundaries of a county; and, chiefly, perhaps, for this reason, its connexion with London was never, in the palmiest days of the city, at all a beneficial one. In like manner, no doubt, the huge tracts of houses now aggregated round the city must have been added to it from time to time by Act of Parliament, if they were to form, in any legal and practical sense, integral parts of it. In the days of the city's power there would, however, have been no difficulty in obtaining such Acts, if ever there had existed the inclination. The disunion of the city and the metropolis is certainly the result, most likely unforeseen, of the selfish policy which the Corporation have pursued. It might not, indeed, be expedient for the country, nor for the executive Government, to have the municipal authority of the whole metropolis vested in the hands of a single corporation. A real Lord Mayor of London, of the whole undivided town, might, in times of domestic turmoil, be a very awkward officer for the Home Secretary to deal with. But it was not, indeed it could not have been, from any such prescient apprehensions, that centuries ago the city was content to confine itself within the narrow boundaries which had sufficed for it in Saxon times. The London of Charles II. gave no promise of the London of Victoria. No prophetic alderman of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries could have foreseen that extending the benefits (at that time very great) of city rights and franchises to the surrounding hamlets would ever produce the smallest inconvenience. It was the rising spirit of selfishness and clique which restricted their view to their own supposed advantage, and the increase of their own dignity. They retained for their own exclusive benefit all which they had extracted from the Parliament or the Crown, and their successors will suffer for it, as it is but just they should. They obtained these rights as being the metropolis, or as representing it, and they must not be permitted to retain them merely to be used against that which they profess to represent.

It would not, perhaps, be just thus to deal with them if the Corporation had shown any signs of a more liberal and generous temper, or if the maintenance of these privileges was consistent with an enlarged expediency, or with justice to the rest of the community. But it is in the nature of exclusive bodies to become more and more selfish and exclusive, and the Corporation of London have proved no exception to the rule. In fact, of late years, their affairs have been managed in a spirit increasingly narrow and vulgar-minded. This has arisen, probably, to some extent, from the gradual withdrawal from amongst them of the highest class of merchants, and the substitution of the shopkeeper class and the shopkeeper spirit as the ruling element in corporation affairs. The great merchants have gone to live elsewhere. Within the memory of not very old persons, the city was still the dwelling-place of many a great trading prince, who lived where his business lay, and naturally took part, from time to time, in the municipal government. This is all at an end. The first class men have ceased to reside in the city, and have withdrawn from all share in the management of its affairs. The present Corporation dispute this, and attempted elaborately to disprove it before the recent Commission. But they failed. In spite of Mr. Pearson's laboured and lengthy panegyric upon each member of the Court of Aldermen, the result of which was that they were a set of honest and industrious tradesmen, which no one ever denied, the fact still remains that, with the exception of Alderman Thompson, (who, by the way, is since dead,) not a single member of what may be called the aristocracy of commerce is to be found amongst them. Whether they are a better set of people, and do their work in better style than when great merchants were among them, as they themselves contend in their own defence before the Commission, is another matter, which we will consider by-and-by. The allegation, whatever it may be worth, that the greatest traders in the city at present stand aloof altogether from the Corporation, appears to us to be, beyond controversy, true.

While, however, their internal character has undergone considerable modification, not, certainly, for the better, their external influence, and the prestige of their name, was for a long while undiminished. Their power in Parliament was, and perhaps still is, very considerable. Four members of their own, and a fifth, in the person of the Recorder, united as they almost always are on city questions, make in themselves, and through their various connexions, a formidable phalanx. But the fact of one of their officers, the Remembrancer, being a regular parliamentary agent, with an acknowledged right of access to the House of Commons, bound to watch all bills which affect,

however remotely, the interests of the city, and being constantly on the spot, gives them an advantage with an assembly like the House of Commons possessed by scarcely any other body in the country, and one of which, naturally enough, they make sedulous and skilful use. An amusing instance of their power, of the occasions which they think call for its exercise, and the manner of its employment, was given by one of the witnesses before the recent Commission. It appears that it was proposed by Lord Melbourne to extend the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Police into the City of London; but, says Mr. Rogers, 'it was objected to by the Corporation. They petitioned the House of Commons. They saw that the Minister was determined. They then addressed the Crown, and a gracious answer was given; but they understood its nature. The Minister was still determined, and they then acted on the French maxim, "Help thyself, and Heaven will help thee." They immediately fixed their Town Clerk in New Palace-yard; they gave him a large body of assistants, and instructed him to communicate with every corporation in the United Kingdom. The consequence was, by the influence of the country corporations, the Minister found that his support fell like a rope of sand. He gave up his measure.' Mr. Rogers is pressed as to the *modus operandi*, but on this he is impenetrable. 'It is not for me to say how; but the thing was done.' No doubt it was, very effectually; and we can easily understand poor Lord Melbourne being routed ignominiously from the field, his parliamentary forces cut off in detail by the repeated sallies of the gallant Town Clerk at the head of his 'large body of assistants' from the intrenched camp in New Palace-yard. Mr. Rogers, we should state, appears, from other portions of his evidence, to be a gentleman of a warm imagination; and the more cautious Remembrancer states in his evidence that he 'should say' this description was 'overcharged.' But it affords a pretty good sample of the popular belief as to the parliamentary influence of the Corporation; and, however the description may be 'overcharged,' we may be quite certain that 'the thing was done;' and that the same thing has been done again and again of late years by the City.

Indeed, if Parliament were the country, and the feelings of Parliament were the reflection of the feelings even of the intelligent portion of the people, it is probable that no reform of the Corporation would ever have taken place. The mass of members of parliament do not understand the subject, and do not care about it. The abuses and anomalies of civic administration never come across or annoy them in any way, and the Commission would have been unissued but for the press and the

public. But although Parliament was apathetic, the press was not; and a cry had been got up to some extent, as we have said, exaggerated and misdirected; and the Government, finding it really necessary to do something, issued a Commission to Mr. Labouchere, Sir John Patteson, and Mr. Cornewall Lewis, to inquire into the subject, and recommend alterations. The result of the labours of these eminent men is before us in a blue book; and their recommendations, practical and sensible as they appear to us to be, will effect little less than a revolution, if they are ever carried into execution. The antiquarian and legal part of the inquiry had been already done to their hands by the former Royal Commissioners in 1837. The City of London, although it escaped legislation at that time, did not escape investigation altogether; and as Sir Francis Palgrave was a member of that Commission, we should expect to find, what is in fact the case, that the historical and documentary information relating to the Corporation was thoroughly exhausted, and admirably digested, (probably by him,) in the summary of evidence appended by those Commissioners to the report they presented to the King. The late Commissioners confined themselves more exclusively to the practical view of the question, to ascertaining the financial position of the city; the working of its municipal system as to its elections, patronage, and general administration; the grounds of the deep and widespread discontent, the existence of which cannot be denied; the particular points in which the city privileges had become galling or intolerable to the community; and, with regard to many of them, the wisdom or even possibility of their continued maintenance. That on such a variety of subjects, so difficult and complicated, they should have arrived at unanimous conclusions, while it says a great deal for their own candour and moderation, says hardly less for the strength of the facts with which they had to grapple.

The Corporation, however, appear to have very much misapprehended the nature of the attack to which they were really most liable to be exposed, and against which they had in truth the weakest defence. Misled by the strong language of the press, and the indiscriminating imputations of some of the extreme reformers, they appear to have thought that individual acts of malversation, and charges of personal corruption, would form the staple of the Commissioners' investigation. This was a mistake. Few only of the witnesses distinctly charged them with corruption; the instances of corruption mentioned were but few; and of those few several failed in proof. They did not, it must be owned, come quite scatheless out of the inquiry; but it was the system and the temper of their administration,

rather than the persons who conduct it, which were most powerfully and successfully impugned. The few instances of misconduct, to which we shall presently advert, were but the natural result of a system in itself rotten and corrupt, full of waste, and extravagance, and selfish jobbing, and only redeemed from universal execration and contempt by the presence in the governing body of many really able and upright men, who would be an honour to any assembly, men such as Mr. Dakin, Mr. Salomons, and others, who no doubt, as far as their influence extends, inspire the Corporation with a better spirit, and lead it now and then into liberal and praiseworthy acts. Their official defence therefore before the Commissioners, though undoubtedly a well-drawn paper of self-laudation, was for the most part irrelevant.

On certain points of primary importance there was no defence to be made. The various municipal constituencies and modes of election in the City, for instance, 'can be reduced to no common or sensible principle, and have not the defence of some anomalies, that they work well. These anomalies are well stated in the following passage from the recent Report:—

'The voters in the Ward elections must now fulfil two conditions: 1st, they must be freemen of the Corporation; 2dly, they must be occupiers of premises within the ward, rated at not less than 10*l.* per annum, and residing within seven miles of the city. The freedom of the city is acquired by patrimony (or inheritance from parents), by apprenticeship, or by redemption. Before the year 1835 no person could be admitted to the freedom of the city, who did not belong to one of the trading companies; but by a resolution of the Court of Common Council of 17th March, 1835, this condition was repealed, and it is no longer necessary that a freeman should be a liveryman or member of one of the city companies. At present, therefore, the system which governs the elections of the corporations is wholly anomalous; two elective bodies exist, which might by possibility be independent of each other. In the Common Hall elections none vote but liverymen of companies, who, though they must be freemen, need not occupy premises within the city. At the wardmote elections, none vote but ten pound occupiers within the ward, who, though they must be freemen, need not be members of companies. It is therefore a conceivable case that the majority of the voters in Common Hall might not be entitled to vote in the wards, and that a majority of the voters in the wards might not be entitled to vote in Common Hall, so that one set of interests might predominate in the election of lord mayor, and another in the election of aldermen and common councilmen.'

But even the best of these two constituencies, that which votes at ward elections, is by no means free from objection. By its qualifications some of the first traders in the world are excluded from voting, or taking any interest in the municipal affairs of the City, for they are often not freemen of the City, and are scarcely ever resident within it. For the other constituency, that of the Common Hall, not a word is to be said.

The exclusive rights of the Liverymen of the Companies arose out of the encroachments on the general rights of the citizens which those bodies began to make in the time of Edward IV., and which after strenuous and ineffectual resistance, were finally legalised by Act of Parliament in the time of George II. It may well have been centuries back, when the various trading companies were practical and working bodies, exercising discipline over the members of their trade, keeping them together, teaching them their art, answering for their characters, extending to them a kindly and paternal protection and support, that to be a member of a company implied being a respectable man, and that a man who was not a member of some company or other had little business or interest in the city. But that state of things, if it ever existed, has long since passed away. The Companies, except two or three, such as the Stationers', the Apothecaries', and the Goldsmiths', have ceased to have any working connexion with the trades whose names they bear. The rich companies give many and good dinners; the poor companies few and bad ones; but connexion with, or interest in the affairs of the Corporation they have, as companies, absolutely none. Yet a certain portion of their members alone elect the Lord Mayor, the Chamberlain, the Sheriffs, and a few other minor civic officers. The elections by the Livery are described without a dissentient voice as marked by the grossest corruption and irregularity. There are no lists of the Liverymen, and the poorer companies have some of the very worst characters in the city amongst their livery. In cases of contested elections false personation and bribery is unlimited. The last election for the office of Chamberlain, which as it is a place of great profit, is generally contested, cost near 10,000*l*. A contested election for the office of Lord Mayor, at the time of the Reform excitement, twenty years ago, cost a nearly similar sum; and no one can pretend to tell the proportion of false and real votes polled on either of these occasions. On the ordinary meetings to elect a Sheriff, only a few persons attend, and these it seems generally of the lowest order, and in the pay of one or more persons who make a market of them. To be sheriff, unless you wish to become a member of the Corporation, is a profitless, troublesome, and very expensive office. A man, liable to be elected, who is elected, must take the office or pay a fine varying in amount from 400*l*. to 600*l*.; and accordingly an unhappy citizen, known to be unambitious of civic dignity, but to be liable to its imposition, is waited upon a few days before the day of election, and told that the honours of the Shrievalty will inevitably fall upon his devoted head, unless he favours the person waiting on him with a cheque, varying in

amount, not to purchase votes but to escape them. Men swear, protest, and pay; for those who will not pay find themselves elected sheriffs, and then either have to pay to the inexorable Corporation 600*l.* for refusing to serve, or have to go through the trouble and annoyance of discharging the duties of the office at the far more serious expense of 1,200*l.* or 1,500*l.* It seems almost incredible, but it is true, that this system has been going on year by year, nay went on within this very last year, in the heart of the capital of England. And we have no doubt that a vast quantity of indignant eloquence on the sanctity of vested rights and the importance of popular assemblies, will be discharged at the head of any minister who is bold enough to propose the abolition of an assembly, which is the scene and occasion of practices so disgraceful. Abolished however it will be, we trust, in accordance with the recommendation of the Commissioners, as most certainly it ought to be.

The chief yearly fruit of this creditable assembly is 'the first magistrate of the first city in the world,' (to use the regular periphrasis of postprandial oratory for the Lord Mayor,) chosen by the Common Hall from those aldermen who have served the office of Sheriff. The production,—separating of course the office from the persons of the respectable men who have filled it, and may fill it again,—is worthy of the soil which grows it. The state and splendour of this dignitary cannot be brought home to an uncivic mind, except by a diligent study of the municipal blue books. If any of these have crossed the channel, we can comprehend the impression of unapproachable magnificence produced upon our French friends' mind, which issued in the famous saying, '*comte, marquis, duc, peut-être lord mayor,*' as the summit and *ne plus ultra* of an Englishman's ambition. The Cheapside monarch, like the one at Pimlico, has his lords in waiting, and equerries, and gentlemen at arms, and master of the ceremonies, and carver, and trumpeter, and swordbearer, and captain of his yacht, and a lot more, under quaint, and perhaps ancient, but certainly obscure appellations. There is for instance the serjeant carver, and serjeants of chamber, and serjeant of channel, and yeomen of the waterside, and water bailiff, and barge-master, and common hunts' young man, and common crier's young man, and water-bailiff's first and second young man, and many others; not domestic servants, be it observed, (for a lord mayor might perhaps be indulged with a dozen footmen,) but *officers* of state, with salaries, and dresses, and fees, bringing many of these places up to 350*l.* and 400*l.* a-year. If we turn to the account of their functions, we shall generally find them comprised in the mystic words, 'to attend the Lord Mayor.'¹ Now

¹ See Report of 1837, p. 115, seqq.

all this is ridiculous nonsense. What pretence is there for giving a man 350*l.* a-year to 'attend the Lord Mayor,' generally now a respectable retail trader, elected in rotation to administer municipally for a year one-ninth, and that not the most important ninth of the metropolis? The aggregate of his expenses is enormous. Mr. Williams, the Member for Lambeth, in his evidence, charging the interest of the money which has been expended on the Mansion-House, puts him down as costing 25,000*l.* a-year. This is certainly somewhat more than can be fairly charged, but if we put him at 20,000*l.* a-year, we shall probably be not very far wrong.¹ And the greatest part of this money is simply wasted, in childish pageants or foolish state and feasting, which do not the smallest good to any one, and for which no sensible man respects the office one atom the more. The mayors of Liverpool, of Bristol, of Leeds, of Manchester, of Hull, and other places, govern larger, wealthier, and more important populations for less than a twentieth of this sum. To abate the vulgar display of the Lord Mayor and his household will we hope be an early duty of the reformed Corporation.

The Aldermen, who come next on the civic pyramid of which the Lord Mayor is the apex, are open to observations much of the same kind. Elected by their wards for life, and existing as a separate court, with unchecked command over the City's purse, they occupy positions and claim a consideration altogether unreal and absurd. To judge from Mr. Pearson's series of biographical sketches presented to the Commissioners at the close of their labours, they are, at present, a thriving set of tradesmen, or of tradesmen who have retired upon a competence. Their functions, except that of eating and drinking, do not appear of a very exalted or important character. They sit with the judges at the Old Bailey, as Mr. Rogers says,² to assist the judges, as every one else knows, never presuming to interfere. They act as magistrates with various success, generally speaking through their clerk, like other magistrates, occasionally also like other magistrates disregarding him, *not* to the advantage of the public nor of their own reputation. And practices were deposed to by witnesses of the highest respectability as occasionally obtaining amongst them, by no means creditable either to their taste or feeling. It appears for

¹ In the statement of the City accounts, at page xxvii. seqq. of the Report of the late Commission, which is very well done, the civil government of the City, 'including the Lord Mayor,' is set down at 27,000*l.* per annum altogether. But we are puzzled by the term 'civil government.' It does *not* include judges' salaries, nor expenses of magistracy, which are put down at an additional 17,500*l.*, nor police, prisons, and coroner, which figure for 29,000*l.* more. What *great* items it *does* include besides the Lord Mayor we do not know; we suspect few or none.

² Evidence, p. 266.

example, that an alderman if he is personally offended by any illegal practice, may summon the offender before him and commit him; and if the convicted person appeals to the courts at Westminster, the alderman defends his judgment at the expense of the City, by an order on the Chamberlain and solicitor. Such things cannot now be done, even by country magistrates; and however little dignity and good sense is sometimes to be found in the magistrates of the provinces, those of the City appear to be in no degree their superiors.

One function of the Court of Aldermen was curiously explained and commented upon in the course of the recent investigation. The Corporation and their officers derive a large income from their jurisdiction over the London brokers, which is the result of a simple and indeed scarcely disguised extortion. It is not pretended that it is useful to any one, neither to the brokers themselves who are controlled effectually by the Stock Exchange, nor to the public at large. Any man who wants to be a broker, is compelled to be a freeman of the City, to be admitted as a broker by the Corporation, to pay 5*l.* a-year to the City chest, and to wear and produce a silver badge if required. It costs a man about 26*l.* in fees to offices, and 5*l.* a-year to the City. No inquiry is made, a mere nominal security is required, and no control is in practice exercised, so that a swindler may become a broker to-morrow, without any hindrance from the City, so long as he pays their fees, and an unfortunate man who employs him may be swindled out of his money, and the City will afford him neither protection nor redress. Their duty in fact is to receive 5,000*l.* a-year, and to do nothing in return for it, and the 5,000*l.* a-year they exact with great severity. We can scarcely, indeed, conceive a more disgusting example of the spirit in which they are not ashamed to act, than the instance we subjoin of a prosecution instituted by them to recover penalties against a highly respectable man, who had acted as a stockbroker without their authority. We extract the statement from the evidence of Mr. Lawrence, one of the first brokers in the City, and we desire our readers to remember that it has not been pretended that the Corporation render any services in return for the payments they enforce:—

‘ Mr. Powell was one of the most respectable men on the Stock Exchange. He had been thirty-six years acting as a stockbroker without any interference. He had a great dislike to taking upon himself any of the city offices, and was never a freeman. A person came into his office, and requested him to buy 50*l.* of Government reduced Stock. He said he was a stranger to him, and he had better go to some one about the Bank. He said, “I am afraid of being cheated. I wish to come to a person I know.” He purchased them for him. This person was an informer, and the next day he laid an information against him. He defended the case. It was

decided against him in the Court of Queen's Bench, and he told me he paid 1,200*l.* for penalties and the law expenses; the expenses being of course swelled by the enormous fees of the City Solicitor, the Remembrancer, and the law officers of the city.

'When was that case decided?—About ten years ago.

'Was the prosecution instituted by the City?—Yes; in the name of Mr. Clark, who was the Chamberlain, on the information of an informer whom he employed for this purpose.'—Evidence, p. 334.

The Common Council re-enacts upon a greater scale and in more numerous examples the part played by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen. Consisting as it does of 240 members, besides the Aldermen, for all of whom dinners are to be found and business provided, all of whom have friends to serve and interests to promote, we may readily imagine the consumption of time, the waste of money, the extent of jobbing, of which it is the source. Every body is on some one or more of the committees, into which the whole body is divided. Each of these committees has its allowance for expenses, which means for dinners, and many thousands a year still go in these civic feasting. The chairmen are selected, we are told, for strength of head and stomach, rather than of intellect and reason. And these perpetual dinners and committees of course foster a spirit of exclusiveness and clique, and encourage a waste of time in doing business, which makes the business ill-done and done often in a vexatious and litigious way. An executive body of 266, split up into committees of 25 or more, is obviously the most inconvenient and senseless machine that ever was invented for doing any work. Every one must have his plan, his speech and his dinner. And the temptation to play into one another's hands which must arise from this constant intercourse and gossip, the history of the Corporation shows to be in fact, what common sense tells us it would be, altogether irresistible.

For as a manufactory of business and of places, the Corporation of London is unrivalled in the world. In addition to the conservancy of the river, which does not add largely to their staff, they have to conduct the ordinary business of a not very large municipality. Their income from every source, including the coal-tax and the rates which they lay on the inhabitants, is about 550,000*l.* a-year. The number of their officers we cannot venture even to approximate. Two folio pages of the Report of 1837, are occupied by the names of some of them only. Mr. Hickson states, and we are sure he does not overrate, the aggregate income of these officers alone at 120,000*l.* a-year, which is nearly *six times* as much as the *whole expenditure* of the Borough of Leeds, a place in population and extent considerably larger than the City of London. But this state of things becomes more intelligible when we fully comprehend several inflexible rules

which appear to guide the discharge of business by the Corporation. Upon any given head of business, they first appoint one or two officers, each at a salary larger than that which is paid anywhere else for the discharge of the whole of a similar class of business. They then add a large establishment of clerks, who together cost perhaps double the salary of the head officer, and thus the business is done at almost three times the cost, by double the number of people it requires. Another rule is to divide accounts and multiply offices as much as possible, and thus they manage to get four or five establishments where one would do, and places for four or five times the number of retainers which is really wanted. Another, is to appoint efficient men to conduct different departments, who understand their business and can do it; and then to subject them to the perpetual interference of large committees, composed of incompetent men, who do not understand anything about the business, and who are simply and very greatly in the way. By a single-minded attention to these rules, and to the principle which animates them, it is wonderful how much may be got out of how little, and what a number of respectable men may receive respectable salaries out of an amount of business, which persons unversed in these rules would never think required either the men or the salaries. This reads like sarcasm, but it is simple truth. There are, for instance, three solicitors under different names and with separate establishments, to do the work of one, three judges with (in the aggregate) unreasonable salaries where one would be enough, four counsel to advise where one would be abundant. So almost every one who came before the Commission bore testimony to the high character and great ability of the heads of various departments under the Corporation. Not only the judicial officers, of whom every one speaks with great respect, but harbourmasters, bridgemasters, chief clerks, controllers, and the rest are all spoken of as excellent in their different ways; and the universal complaint has been of perpetual and mischievous interference with them by the committees of the Corporation, who waste time and mismanage everything they undertake.

This is the real charge which the Corporation have to meet, the charge of being a selfish, exclusive jobbing body, wastefully extravagant in their management, spending public money not for the public good, neglecting great interests, obstructing improvement, impeding commerce, oppressing individuals. Some curious and instructive instances came out in the course of the investigation, showing that the general impression on these heads was certainly not unfounded and hardly exaggerated.

In 1853 the Corporation issued at one blow 4,082 processes

against persons in the City for not taking up their freedom. They were all retail traders, and mostly poor men; and rightly to estimate the proceeding of the Corporation, it should be remembered, that the Corporation had themselves brought in a bill just before, in which they had in fact resigned the right of thus enforcing freedom; and that the freedom conferred absolutely no benefits whatever upon the persons compelled to take it up. It was simply a means of frightening so much money out of the pockets of poor people, who of course could not venture to go to law with the City; and the money was extorted to swell the City's income and the fees of the City's officers. The great men who could and would fight the City, who could resist and perhaps get the obnoxious law abolished, the great merchants and wholesale dealers, on no legal and equitable principle, but from very intelligible if not very creditable motives, have been always let alone by the Corporation.

In one respect only have the Corporation ventured to attack great men. We mentioned some pages back that a man liable to be elected Sheriff, who was elected and who declined to serve, had to pay 400*l.* or 600*l.* to the City chest. These fines in comparatively recent times were made the means of the most iniquitous extortion. If the Corporation wanted money, men were nominated in numbers who it was known would not serve, for the mere purpose of appropriating their fines. Thus the enormous expense of the civic entertainments to the foreign Sovereigns in 1814, was defrayed by exacting 26,199*l.* from private individuals, in the five years from 1814 to 1818, inclusive. The same spirit has been shown once or twice since, but it is only fair to say that great improvement has taken place in this respect in the last twenty years. How far a discussion in the House of Commons and a return moved for and obtained by Mr. Divett, (from which we have taken the above facts,) may have influenced the Corporation, we cannot tell; but for some reason or other they have been influenced, and there is no ground for saying that just at the present time they at all seriously abuse this power. It is, however, a power obviously very unsafe; very liable to abuse, and which has been in fact abused; and one which therefore we hope will not be allowed to continue in the hands of persons constantly exposed to peculiar temptations to abuse it.

The Corporation enjoy the right of levying tolls on all vehicles belonging to persons not free of the City, on entering or leaving the City and its liberties. It would never do to enforce this on carriages; the thing would have blown up long ago. So if a great lady comes from the West End to a shop on Ludgate Hill, and carries away with her silks and velvets to the

amount of 20*l.* or 30*l.* she goes and returns unquestioned. But if a poor fellow with a donkey cart buys a pat of butter, or a bit of fish, or a leg of mutton, the inexorable Corporation mulct him on the spot. Nor is there in this, any more than in the former cases, any pretence of benefit resulting either to the individual or the public. It is a tax for the sole benefit of the Corporation, levied, as the former were levied, with a very odious sort of discrimination.

So again in the exercise of powers which they claim as conservators of the river Thames, the same selfish and illiberal spirit is discernible. The bed and soil of the river is matter which had long been fiercely contested between them and the Crown. But with a title of known weakness and doubt, the Corporation have been in the habit of granting licences to individuals to erect projections into the stream, or to embank the river, of course on the payment of certain fees; and if any one presumes to deal in any way with the soil of the river without their permission, a lawsuit with the Corporation would be inevitable. But it was proved before the Commissioners that their notion of duty ceased with the due reception of the fee. Suspecting possibly that they could not prevent erections in the river, and thinking it as well to profit by them, they are in the habit of making grants quite inconsistent with the interest of their own prior grantees; and if asked to interpose with their authority to vindicate rights encroached upon, and to prevent litigation, they discover that they have no power to interfere, and that the whole matter (except their right to the fee) is in considerable doubt and obscurity. In short, they do not really conserve the Thames; they do not remove shoals; they do not prevent encroachments; they license them when it brings them money to do so; they abstain from interference when to interfere would be inconvenient and unprofitable.

But it is when the Corporation go to law that we see in its fullest development their unpopular and oppressive character. Their legal proceedings are indeed the strongest arguments for curtailing their powers, and reducing within more reasonable limits a revenue which tempts them to such vast expenditure. The pomp and panoply of retainers with which the Corporation take the field, and the immense resources of legal artillery and engineering which they employ to overwhelm, embarrass, and delay, are enough to frighten, and do in fact frighten, most opponents into submission before the commencement of actual hostilities. Now and then, however, they meet a rich or stubborn antagonist, and then the picture becomes instructive. Two great lawsuits were detailed in evidence before the late Commission. One was a suit with the Crown as to the bed and

soil of the river. That action has been pending for more than ten years. It has taken that time to compel the Corporation to give a satisfactory account of their title, and during that time there have been nine several decisions on this preliminary point in the case, from Masters in Chancery, Masters of the Rolls, Lord Chancellors, and the House of Lords, and every single one against them.

The other was a suit with the great brewers, Combe, Delafield & Co. The Corporation claim a right to measure, and to be paid for, all measurable articles brought, not into the City, but into the Port of London; the port reaching from Yantlet Creek in Kent to Staines Bridge in Middlesex, a distance by the river of something between eighty and ninety miles. Combe & Co. made a great quantity of malt in Norfolk, which they brought up in their own ships to their own wharf in Westminster, and thence carried it to their great brewery in the Seven Dials. All this malt the City claimed to measure. Combe & Co. replied that they did not want it measured, they knew the quantity, and were not going to sell, but to use it themselves. Thereupon the City claimed to be paid for it as if they had measured it. This amounted to a claim on Combe & Co. of about 1,000*l.* a-year. This claim Messrs. Combe resisted, and went to war in 1839. Since that time there have been, as in the other case, a number of pitched battles, every single one adverse to the City. Three times do Messrs. Combe except to the answers of the City, and each time with success. In vain, however, do they apply to see certain documents on which the City put their startling claim. Inspection is refused them, the Vice-Chancellor orders it; the City appeal, and the Lord Chancellor confirms the order; the City appeal again, and, till a few months ago, on this collateral point they have hung up the matter in the House of Lords. It had already cost Messrs. Combe between 2,000*l.* and 3,000*l.*; and at last Mr. Pearson told the Commissioners, that the Corporation never meant to stir the case, for they felt that their right, if they had it, was one which they could not enforce. It is all very well to say this now, in the case of wealthy brewers, powerful enough to hold their own against the Corporation, but we should like to know how often the exercise of the right against smaller and unresisting men has been magnanimously given up, and when it was that the eyes of the Corporation were first opened to the monstrous nature of the right they claimed. Here is a naked claim of 1,000*l.* a-year from a single firm for the sole benefit of the Corporation; there is no pretence of any countervailing advantage to be received by the firm; the firm are put to an expense which to poor men would

be ruinous in resisting it, and finally they are told that the claim is one which the Corporation feel that they cannot enforce! No comment could have half the severity of the simplest statement of the facts.

Moreover, the course of these two lawsuits brought into the clearest light the dangers to which individuals are exposed in any conflict with the City. Rights of the widest kind are claimed on the authority of charters which the City will not produce. These charters are often very ancient, and almost always very brief and general in their expressions. Their meaning has to be arrived at, in the words of the Commissioners' Report, 'through the doubtful medium of antiquarian research.' So that first a man does not know on the authority of what documents the claim is made upon him, and then if he gets the documents he often finds it impossible to comprehend how the language of them is any warrant for the claim. But the City have a bottomless purse, out of which they can spend to an unlimited amount, without personally feeling it; they have an inexhaustible array of astute solicitors and clever counsel; the unhappy adversary knows that, if he attacks them, it will take the time and require the resources of a Trojan war to bring them to bay, and in prudent despair he sighs and submits. Thus it happens every day that the power of pecuniary resistance, rather than legal precedent, or sound interpretation, is the real measure of their rights. It adds somewhat, also, to the difficulty of litigating questions with the Corporation, that all their peculiar customs, which are very numerous and often entirely at variance with the ordinary law of the land, have had since the time of William and Mary, the force of an Act of Parliament. They are, moreover, as is well known, the sole judges of their own customs. Even in the Queen's Courts, if a question arises concerning any of these customs in the course of a suit, the judges of the land must accept the certificate of the City with respect to the existence and nature of the custom, delivered *ore tenus* by the mouth of the Recorder, and absolutely binding and conclusive. The customs of London are in themselves for the most part harmless; some of them (such as that of foreign attachment, by means of which, contrary to the common law of England, a creditor can get hold of money belonging to his debtor, which may be in the hands of a third person) are very salutary, and might with advantage be extended beyond the boundaries of the city itself. Nor perhaps is there much danger of the Recorder, now-a-days, abusing his privilege of absolute interpretation. But it is a power which might be abused, and which there is no real reason for retaining. Nor is it desirable that a number of obscure customs,

all possibly still in existence, because not specifically abolished by Act of Parliament, should be allowed to linger on in a doubtful and twilight life, to tempt the astuteness of the City lawyers, and to be disinterred perhaps now and then to defeat some just claim, or enforce some harsh exaction. The Commissioners have recommended that the customs which it is desirable to retain should be enumerated and enacted once for all by Parliament, that all customs not enumerated in the Act should cease and be repealed, and that the interpretation of the customs of London, like that of all other laws local or general, should be intrusted, as it ought to be, to the Judges of the Superior Courts. Few persons, we imagine, except those immediately connected with the Corporation, will doubt the wisdom and expediency of this recommendation.¹

Again, the whole history and administration of one of their most important sources of revenue, the tax on coal, is equally discreditable to them. Their possession of it arose in the first instance out of a breach of trust. The Court of Aldermen, in their character of Court of Orphans, are by old custom trustees for the personal estate of orphans in the city. A sum of 750,000*l.* was in their hands in this capacity in the reign of Charles II. This sum they lent to the king, and the king having spent it, refused to repay it. They had no kind of right to lend the money. The orphans grew clamorous, and the Corporation, bound to repay them, knew not where to find the means. From Parliament, in the time of William and Mary, they obtained a grant of four-pence per ton for ever on all coal imported into the port of London, in addition to the charge of eight-pence per ton for metage, which they enjoyed under a charter of James I. A very complicated series of Acts in succeeding reigns has raised this duty to thirteen-pence per ton, and continued it at that rate to 1862, extending the tax to all coals brought within twenty miles of the General Post Office.² Nine-pence per ton of this duty the City receive, but administer under special Acts of Parliament; four-pence

¹ The whole subject of whether general acts of Parliament repeal City Customs *in pari materia*, without specifically naming them, is exceedingly difficult and subtle. Mr. Pulling and Mr. Sergeant Merewether, both highly competent persons, differed materially in their evidence on this matter when examined by the late Commission. The City Customs being in fact local Acts of Parliament, the question is raised on each occasion (and some of the occasions are very serious), whether a general act has repealed a particular act which is inconsistent with it; one of the most doubtful questions in the law, and one on which the decisions of the Courts have been constantly conflicting.

² Those who desire to understand an important practical matter will find the result of these various Acts stated with great clearness and precision in a paper presented to the late Commission, by Mr. Tyrrell, the present Remembrancer, and printed p. 639 of their evidence.

per ton is carried to the account of their own estate, and spent exactly as they please. And this tax they claimed before the Commissioners as their private property, the Orphans having been long since satisfied. Their officers were solemn and emphatic on the sacredness of this 60,000*l.* a-year, and spoke of interfering with it as an act of confiscation. So that it is gravely contended that a public body is to receive for ever from every one within twenty miles of London four-pence per ton on all the coals which are burnt, because their predecessors improvidently and improperly lent a profligate and dishonest sovereign money, which they held as trustees, two hundred years ago.¹

We cannot quit this portion of our subject without noting one other matter, which has been perhaps too little dwelt upon in general, but which seems to us peculiarly characteristic of that civic spirit which we have been attempting to describe.

The Corporation, it is well known, have the general right of metage over all measurable articles which come into the Port of London; and amongst these, of course, corn holds a prominent place. The metage of other articles, such as coal, fruit, and oysters, they have been in the habit of selling to persons who bought the toll, payable on the metage of these articles, but never discharged any duty in respect of it. Wrong no doubt this was, but it was the understanding on which the purchasers bought, and the Corporation sold, the places. The actual measuring, whenever it became necessary; was done at the expense of the traders, by persons whom they provided. Not very long ago the various trades awoke to a sense of the injustice and impropriety of this state of things; they called upon the City to do the measuring which was required, in return for the toll which was exacted in respect of metage. The Corporation having sold the tolls, called upon those who had bought them to perform this duty; and in spite of the protests of the purchasers, and indeed of the fact that they had bought and paid for their situations on the understanding that they were sinecures, and liable to no expense, they were compelled to perform the duty, or to find deputies to do it. But the city had never parted with the tolls on the corn-metage at all, and we shall see in a moment on what principle they dealt with a matter which affected the interests, not of third parties, but of themselves. There is in the city a 'once flourishing, but now decaying and unpopular institution called the Fellowship of Porters; a body privileged to do all the portage of the city,

¹ The Mercers' Company for many years shared in the spoils of the coal-tax; on what grounds the Commissioners of 1837 could not ascertain, nor have we ever heard. The late Commission appears not to have asked any questions on the subject.

but mismanaged, inefficient and powerless. Their affairs are in the hands of an official called the Shifter, appointed by the City, at a salary fixed by the City, and not by the Fellowship. This person also receives the metage dues on corn for the Corporation, and in respect of this he receives no salary; so that the Corporation make a poor body pay him enough for their own work, and for the work of the Corporation also, which is a rich body, but in this instance frugal, for it gets work done at other persons' expense. But farther: the actual work of corn metage is performed by one meter and five or six of the Fellowship of Porters, and the meter does no more nor more important work than the porters do. The metage dues are paid to the City in respect of the single meter; the trade pay separately for the services of the porters; and from a table before us we gather that the single meter receives for metage dues about as much as all the porters receive for actually doing the metage. The case then stands thus:—First, the metage is collected for the City, a rich body, at the expense of the Porters a poor one; then, the actual metage is done *really at the expense of the trade*, the toll, in respect of which it ought to be done by the City, going into their hands very nearly clear of all expense. And these are the very men who, when the tolls are in other persons' hands, as in the case of coal, fruit, &c., profess to think it very wrong that the trade should be put to any expense by those who receive the tolls! Little is heard about it, because the Porters are unpopular, and the corn trade charge the extra expenses to the consumer, but as an exhibition of the civic spirit it is very complete.

Illiberal and unhandsome as these proceedings are, there is, we must observe, nothing in them which can be fairly called corrupt, nothing which touches the personal honour of any member of the Corporation. We can conceive, indeed we can believe the fact to be, that honourable and high-minded men, (and many members of the Corporation are both in an eminent degree,) can blind themselves to the real character of acts which they find in accordance with the precedents of a Corporation, and can be led astray by bad example, and by the influence of a bad surrounding atmosphere, from the courses which as individuals they would undoubtedly pursue. They sink, in fact, their own individuality in the abstraction of the body to which they belong, and justify doing things for its sake, which they never would think of doing for their own. We must not shrink from saying, however, that evidence has been published by the Commissioners which seems to go considerably beyond this, and to convict members of the Corporation of conduct which something like wilful delusion alone could justify. There have been, till quite of late years, what the Commis-

sioners called 'great,' what we should venture to call 'gross' abuses in the management of the Irish property. The Irish Society, a curious offshoot of the Corporation, in fact one of its committees, (the governor of the society being necessarily an alderman, and all the members of it necessarily members of the Common Council,) is a body of trustees to manage certain large estates in and about the towns of Londonderry and Coleraine, for the general advancement of religion and civilization in the north of Ireland. Twelve of the London companies, members of which contributed the funds wherewith the plantation of Ulster was effected by the City of London, in the time of James I. after the repeated rebellions of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, hold also in several-ty large estates in that part of the country; and, till quite of late years, the Irish Society was accustomed to distribute large sums of money yearly amongst these companies, instead of spending their whole revenue to advance the purposes for which they were incorporated. This was bad enough; but it appears also that quite recently they were in the habit of mingling in all the corruptions and excitements of Irish elections, and that on one occasion as much as £3,000 of these sacred trust moneys were spent by the Society in promoting the return of their governor in a contested election for Coleraine. This was very disgraceful; and we fear is but too good a proof of what the same men would have done with the funds of the City of London, if the temptation to misappropriation had been as great, and the risk of immediate detection of it as small, in London as in Ulster.

For even where the risk of immediate discovery was considerable, practices have been ventured upon, to say the least, very questionable, the real character of which, however, even after it had been pointed out to them, the Corporation witnesses appeared unable to appreciate. Some little time ago the Corporation, not satisfied with their position before the world, and unable to command the services of any well-established newspaper, actually negotiated and completed the purchase of a paper, which was to set them straight with mankind, and do justice to their virtues and good deeds. The paper died after a very brief and ineffective life; *but the money for its purchase came out of the Corporation funds, and was disguised under some vague and general item in the published accounts.* This transaction speaks for itself, and our readers will probably not hesitate to apply to it its right epithets, though we refrain. Equally unfortunate, and equally indefensible, appear to have been the proceedings taken by the City to oppose the removal of Smithfield Market. The Corporation appointed a Committee to conduct the opposition, with unlimited power over the City purse; for it was conceived

to be matter of paramount importance to the interests of the Corporation that infuriated beasts should be driven headlong, by hundreds, through the most crowded streets of London into the very heart of the city; and that the filth and stench of the blood and offal of their slaughter should be congregated in the midst of a dense population. Accordingly the Committee set vigorously to work, and spared no expense. In the happy phrase of Mr. Benjamin Scott, they proceeded 'to elicit public opinion;' which meant, as he explained it under the Commissioners' gentle pressure, that they sent round paid agitators to make speeches at prepared meetings, to concoct petitions, and to procure, how is not specified, all the signatures which could be obtained. They marched a platoon of counsel into the parliamentary committee rooms to oppose the Bill there. Other legal and medical gentlemen were paid for 'literary services.' Articles 'found their way into newspapers' in an unexplained, but peculiarly opportune fashion. Lawyers demonstrated that to touch Smithfield Market would be tyrannically to violate the first and most sacred principles of municipal liberty. Doctors proved that fevered meat was peculiarly wholesome, and exhalations from slaughter-houses singularly salubrious. Mr. Scott admitted that any payments for these services would be looked for in vain in the published statement of the City's accounts. They were disguised under the general entry of 'miscellaneous expenditure;' why he did not exactly know, but it had been 'considered' better not to go into detail, and he had observed, as matter of experience, that agitations were most successful when most apparently spontaneous, and when their causes and sources were most carefully concealed.

There is scarcely another public body in the kingdom which would have set to work in a fashion so undignified, so clumsy, and so entirely contrary to good feeling and right principle. Scorn at their detection mingles with indignation at their misuse of public position, public character and public money. And when we see that this is what some of their best men appear to be still inclined to vindicate, and even on a similar occasion to repeat, we cannot but feel it is high time that some order was taken with them, and that they should be told that, whatever they may think of it, such conduct is neither decent nor respectable; that if it came to be often repeated, the present demand for their reform would speedily become a cry for their abolition; that it would be impossible for men of honour and character, such as now illustrate and adorn their ranks, to stand by them any longer, or share even the divided responsibility of such proceedings, and that they would rapidly sink from their present influential and honourable position, to a far lower level,

and become the refuge of men bankrupt in means and character, who would neither deserve nor receive the smallest measure of popular respect.

‘ *Miseræ plebi commune sepulchrum
Pantolabo scurræ Nomentanoque nepoti.*’

What is the defence which the City have set up to this case against them? As it seems to us, one totally inapplicable and irrelevant. They addressed themselves to defend the legality of their proceedings, their solvency, their personal honour, their general freedom from peculation or corruption. We grant it fully. Subject, as we have said already, to some not numerous exceptions, their antagonists had not attacked the positions which they selected to defend. Doubtless no cloud rests upon the stainless honour of such a man as Mr. Wortley, of whom it is impossible to conceive that he could ever lend himself to any indirect or unworthy course. And if no one else in the Corporation is of the high rank and connexion of the Recorder, there are yet not wanting men of probity and ability, who in a better system, and under other circumstances, would probably have more weight than they have at present, but upon whom it would be unjust, and even absurd to attempt to cast a personal imputation. But these men form part of a body very inferior to themselves; they cannot be ubiquitous; they do not know of a great deal that goes on; and they often find themselves committed to a course of conduct, or made responsible for a proceeding of which it is impossible they can approve, but which they are too generous openly to condemn. It is as unfair and as fallacious to judge of the Corporation by the few picked men whom it contains, as it would be to judge of the character and calibre of the House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone, or Mr. Walpole, or Lord John Russell. The Corporation, in their formal address, did not defend, they did not allude to many of the transactions which we have detailed; and as, judging from the ability of that paper, it is certain that no topic which could be successfully handled, was omitted, we may safely conclude that if nothing was said on these matters, it was for the very good reason that nothing could be said. We should certainly have been glad if some of the proceedings we have been describing had been pointedly disavowed, and regret had been expressed for them. No real dignity would have been lost by such a course. And it must be remembered that if we have absolved many of the Corporation from active participation in them, they have not chosen to absolve themselves from silent and contented acquiescence. Perhaps no stronger proof of the evil influences of the existing Corporation spirit can be given, than that men

of undoubted personal honour do not feel it necessary to protest against measures which they find it impossible to defend.

The point on which alone they made any successful stand was their reply to the accusation that the great merchants had left their ranks during the last century. As to this matter, however, the chief stress of their reply was an inculpation of their predecessors. The Corporation, say they, were bankrupt; jobbing was carried on to an unheard-of height; and aldermen were insolvent, a century ago. It may be so. We are quite willing to take the word of the Corporation for it, that their predecessors were much worse than themselves. But this does not establish the benefits of civic rule, nor make out the purity of the present system.

To the rest of the real substantial attack upon them, they make no real answer. They aver that they have kept within the bounds of the law; that they have charters to show for their rights; Acts of Parliament for their tolls and taxes; opinions of counsel for their lawsuits. Who was ever fool enough to doubt it? Whatever may have been the case in former times, the intelligent officers who now administer their affairs are quite sure to take care that nothing is done without at least a plausible, sometimes a sound, legal reason. How does this meet the charge that they act in a selfish, narrow spirit? Of course they have charters on which they build their claims. How does this tend to show that the claims are not vexatious and oppressive? They have Acts of Parliament in abundance to show for their coal and other taxes. Does that go to prove that Parliament was wise or just, that the taxes in question are politic or tolerable, or that they have been administered in a wise, ungrudging, and conciliatory spirit? And as for opinions of counsel! Why, of course, the opinion of a lawyer depends upon the way the case is stated to him; and we have little doubt that, by some not very great ingenuity of statement, an opinion to any effect that is desired may be drawn from any counsel. There is a well-known, and we believe a true, story, that two neighbours who were about to go to law, each for his own satisfaction consulted Sir William Follett upon his case, and each obtained from Sir William an opinion directly in his favour. Besides, a number of considerations ought to weigh with a body like the Corporation, of which, in giving legal advice, a counsel properly takes no cognizance. He advises simply on the legal bearings of a case; and the question with regard to the City was, not whether they had acted as a cautious lawyer would advise a private individual to act, but whether their endless delay and obstruction and vexation and expense showed the proper spirit in which a great public body should

set to work to vindicate a right held by them in trust for the benefit of the public. Perhaps, indeed, they would deny that this was the question. They might say, indeed several of their ablest witnesses, such as Mr. Serjeant Merewether and Mr. Pearson, did say, that these tolls, and dues, and taxes were their private property, for their private benefit. If so, no doubt custom has sanctioned almost any amount of legal subtlety and chicane in defending a man's private estate; but to us the very presenting this view of the matter appears in the light of a plea of guilty to the charge. It could only be put forward by persons who had taken a false view of their position, and were labouring under a total confusion as to the distinction between the property of private individuals and of public bodies. The Corporation of London is in every sense a public body, with public duties; liable at any moment to be destroyed in its very essence by the will of the Legislature—the mere fiction and creature of the law; and it is idle to compare it with private persons, and assimilate its rights to theirs. It obtained its rights as a great public body, and it is absurd to say that a body, which might be dissolved to-morrow, and cease to exist, without any arbitrary or unconstitutional exercise of parliamentary power, can claim to hold its property indefeasibly, and adversely to parliamentary inspection and control, when it cannot create or guarantee its own legal existence or continuance for a single day. But the claim was characteristic of the feeling of the Corporation, and a tolerable evidence of the spirit of their administration. The Commissioners, we are happy to see, have treated it with entire disregard; and have recommended the total and immediate abolition of all such rights and privileges as appear to be oppressive in their character, or inconsistent with general public policy. They have very properly declined to consider the legal foundation for these rights, which is proper matter for a court of law. They have addressed themselves to the far more important practical question, whether it is wise and just to retain them.

With an assertion of the legality of their proceedings the substantial defence of the Corporation really closed. Indeed, the personal claim was inconsistent with any attempt to show that personal feelings had been disregarded, and larger views generally acted upon. Of course, if the coal-tax belongs to them, as any private individual's house belongs to him, it is no reproach to them that they have spent it on themselves. If, really, the rest of the metropolis, and twenty miles round it, have nothing whatever to do with this tax, except to pay it, they cannot complain that they are totally neglected in the application of its proceeds. Certain metropolitan improvements are made, it is true, out of

certain portions of it, under special Acts of Parliament; but there is a portion which the City claim as their own, and regard as a private gentleman regards his estate, and dispose of accordingly. Yet on this and kindred subjects they have been half-hearted and inconsistent. Again and again they were asked by the Commissioners, if they claimed to represent the metropolis?—and again and again they shrank from giving a direct answer to a pertinent but embarrassing question. Mr. Pearson, indeed, took a bold flight. He said the city and the metropolis *were* identical; that their interests did *not* conflict; and he could not, even in imagination, conceive a case in which they *could*; and that the large streets in the city were a direct, and immediate, and tangible benefit to the people of Staines, and Watford, and Hertford, because they all came to town to the Bank to get dividends, and then they had handsome streets to walk in! But the fact that, except where a special Act of Parliament otherwise directed, all their funds, although derived from so wide an area, were spent upon themselves, was not, as indeed it could not be, disputed. Nor could it be disputed that, in spite of their very large revenues, the municipal government of the City of London was as heavy upon the inhabitants as that of any other city of England, without a tithe or a twentieth of the revenues of the Corporation.

In sewerage, in paving, in police, in prisons, they have something to show for their money; all these, especially the last, are remarkably good in the city; but the expense of them all, except the last, is defrayed out of special rates levied upon the inhabitants. In other matters the catalogue of their deeds is barren. It is melancholy to think how many great and noble works might have been achieved by a municipality alive to its duties, and animated by an elevated feeling, out of those vast sums of money which have been for years eaten up in management and in that heavy and tasteless splendour which surrounds the Corporation. Commerce might have been assisted, education advanced, literature encouraged, the arts promoted, religion fostered, and the City of London have become a Venice without its despotism, a Florence without its turbulence, or a Paris without its irreligion. It is not pleasant to contemplate the dull reality of the picture, the more especially as it seems that the Corporation themselves discern nothing unsatisfactory in it, and appear to promise but little amendment for the future. The Town Clerk, an intelligent and educated gentleman, could not the least understand the outcry; the Corporation, he thought, had done nothing they had not a perfect right to do; he was of opinion, in fact, that all alteration would be for the worse, that the whole thing was as nearly perfect as one could expect any human institution to be, and he really could not suggest any amend-

ments, for he didn't see that there were any amendments to be made. Of metropolitan or national duties we have no recognition; of great metropolitan or national benefits no record. Some small improvements have taken place, some practical amendments in management and as to the sale of offices have been introduced, which it would be unfair altogether to pretermitt; but of a really great and liberal policy, of conceptions adequate to what their position might be, and what their revenues are, there is not the faintest trace. Something has been done for the City school, which under its present master maintains a very good reputation; something, we believe, for the livings of the Irish Society in the North of Ireland; but neither as Church patrons nor as promoters of education have the Corporation ever done anything at all answerable to the great means and opportunities at their command. No great and ancient body ever passed away, as they are about to do, with so few regrets, and so little sympathy.

We have said they are about to pass away, because we cannot doubt that such a Report as that, which has been presented to Her Majesty by Mr. Labouchere, Sir John Patteson and Mr. Cornwall Lewis, will before long, in its general features, be carried into effect by legislation. The Commissioners, at the conclusion of their Report, conveniently recapitulate the heads of their recommendations, and their summary we here subjoin:

1. That a new charter be issued, containing all such provisions in existing charters of the Corporation of London, and all such customs of the City, as it may be deemed expedient to preserve.

2. That the Lord Mayor be elected by the Common Council, from the Common Councillors, or from persons qualified to be Common Councillors.

3. That the Aldermen be elected by the burgesses of the wards for six years, and be re-eligible; that they be justices of the peace during their term of office.

4. That the powers of the Municipal Corporations Act with respect to the appointment of stipendiary magistrates be extended to the Corporation of London.

5. That the Court of Aldermen be abolished, and that its functions be transferred to the Common Council.

6. That the number of wards be reduced to some number not less than twelve, nor greater than sixteen; and that their area and population be, as far as possible, made equal.

7. That each ward return one alderman and five common councilmen to the Common Council; and that their qualification be that prescribed by the Municipal Corporations Act for the larger class of boroughs; namely, the possession of real or personal estate of 1,000*l.*, or being rated on an annual value of at least 30*l.*

8. That the voters in the wardmote elections be the occupiers of premises in the ward rated to the amount of 10*l.* per annum, without any additional qualification.

9. That the elections in Common Hall be abolished.

10. That the sheriffs be elected by the Common Council.

11. That the Lord Mayor's Court and the Sheriff's Court be consoli-

dated, and that an appeal be given from such court to one of the superior courts at Westminster.

12. That the Court of Hustings be abolished.

13. That the Court at St. Martin's-le-Grand be abolished.

14. That all regulations prohibiting persons not free of the City from carrying on any trade, or using any handicraft within the City, be abolished.

15. That the metage of grain, fruit, and other measurable goods, be no longer compulsory.

16. That the Fellowship of Porters be dissolved; and that other privileges of porters be abolished.

17. That the admission of brokers by the Court of Aldermen be abolished.

18. That the street toll on carts not the property of freemen be abolished.

19. That the City police be incorporated with the Metropolitan police.

20. That the conservancy of the River Thames be transferred to a Board consisting of the Lord Mayor, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the President of the Board of Trade, the Deputy Master of the Trinity House, and the First Commissioner of Woods.

21. That the exclusive privileges of the Company of Watermen and Lightermen on the River Thames be abolished.

22. That the accounts of the revenue and expenditure of the Corporation be consolidated.

23. That the money and securities of the Corporation be lodged in the Bank of England.

24. That the election of Auditors be amended.

25. That the provisions of the Municipal Corporations Acts, with respect to the mortgaging of lands, and the making of an annual return of revenue and expenditure to the Secretary of State, be extended to the Corporation of London.

26. That the Irish Society be dissolved, that its trusts be declared by Act of Parliament; and that new trustees be appointed by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland.

27. That the external boundaries of the City remain unchanged; but that the municipal connexion between the Corporation of London and a part of the borough of Southwark be abolished.

28. That the rest of the metropolis be divided into districts for municipal purposes.

29. That in the event of such division being made, a Metropolitan Board of Works be created, composed of members deputed to it from the Council of each metropolitan municipal body, including the Common Council of the City.

30. That the coal duties now collected by the Corporation of London, so long as they remain in force, be under the administration of this Board; and that in case the coal duties, which expire in 1862, should not be renewed, the 4*d*. duty now levied on behalf of the City should cease at the same time.

31. That this Board be empowered to levy a rate, limited to a fixed poundage, for public works of general metropolitan utility, over the metropolitan district.

32. That no works be executed by this Board unless the plans have been approved by a Committee of the Privy Council.'

It will be seen that in our view of the unsatisfactory nature of the defence of the Corporation, we have at least the support of the Commissioners. Most of the points on which they were

attacked,—their brokers' rents, their metage, their coal-tax, their tolls, their vague and unchecked accounts, their enormous expenses of management, their secrecy and obscurity as to their charters,—these and a number of other points are all decided against them by the Report; in courteous and guarded language, no doubt, as befits the station and character of the Commissioners, but in terms clear and unmistakeable. The remedies, though searching and comprehensive, have been applied in a conservative spirit. There has been, we observe, no *doctrinaire* feeling at work to suggest the reforming of London according to some theory of perfection; but the Corporation has been taken as it stands, it has been preserved wherever it was possible or reasonable, and all the changes which are suggested are almost always in accordance with the enactments of the general Municipal Reform Act, which has been proved by experience to work well upon the whole throughout the country. No suggestions are made in detail as to the establishments and expenses of the Corporation, but it is proposed to curtail their funds, to apply an efficient audit to their accounts, to give the great body of citizens at least the opportunity of taking an interest in the working of the system, and to leave to the combined operation of time, general opinion, and good sense, to infuse a better spirit, and limit useless and foolish expenditure. In many particulars the Commissioners have merely confirmed the conclusions of the most intelligent members of the Corporation; with regard to others, such as especially subjecting the aldermen to re-election, abolishing all their tolls and taxes, and dissolving the Irish Society, we fully expect that great opposition will be made to any attempt to put their advice into practice; but their scheme, or something very like it, must be carried, or the whole work will have to be done over again. For in truth the Commissioners have, by the careful and authentic statements of their Report, reduced within more reasonable limits, the extreme pretensions habitually put forward by the Corporation of London, and have shown the little ground there is for submitting to be obstructed by them. These pretensions can hardly survive undiminished the effect of the tabular statement of the population, area, number of houses, and *assessed value* of the property in the city, compared with that of the rest of the metropolis given by the Commissioners in the course of their Report.¹ A good map of London would perhaps answer the

¹ The following is the Table referred to :—

	Metropolis.	City of London.
Area in Acres	78,029	728
Population in 1851	2,362,236	128,833
Inhabited Houses in 1851	305,933	14,698
Assessment in 1852	£9,064,348	£953,110

same end. It would then be seen how complete a delusion it is to suppose that the commerce and the city of London are identical, that there is not vast wealth and commerce beyond the narrow bounds within which the authority of the Corporation is confined. It is plain that some of the metropolitan districts are equal, some even superior to the city in importance, and that it is only its greater antiquity and familiar tradition that maintains it in a predominance to which it has no sufficient claim.

This predominance will be still further diminished if Parliament should sanction the erection of municipalities throughout the metropolis, with a central Board deputed from them for the control of matters of general concern. This is perhaps the most important of the Commissioners' suggestions, and we earnestly hope it will be adopted, for we are sure there is no chance of London being made a fine, convenient, or healthy city till something of this sort is effected for its social government. In practical England, the state of its metropolis, in all that regards its material government and welfare, is a shame and disgrace. There is no cooperation, no unity of purpose or action, no system, no principle. Everything is left to the chance working of individual speculation, and to the powers of multitudes of Boards entirely independent of, and sometimes hostile to, one another. There are, we believe, above seven hundred local Acts of Parliament in force in different parts of London. In one parish, S. Pancras, it appears from the evidence before us that there are seventeen different Paving Boards, which after all do not comprise the whole parish within the limits of their powers. And the want of union between Gas Companies, and Water Companies, and Paving Boards, and Commissioners of Sewers, has become a proverb and a standing nuisance. So certainly as a street is beautifully paved and smoothly laid down, it is torn up to dig a sewer or lay gas-pipes. And so if a street is begun in one part of London which it would be desirable to connect with a street in another, it is absolutely certain that the desired connexion will not take place; it is probable that some peculiarly ugly and inconvenient obstruction will be built exactly where it ought not. Within the last year the front view of S. Paul's has been seriously damaged by a monster warehouse: and at this very time Mr. Hickson, in his evidence before the Commission, informs the good people of Marylebone that their sewers are about to be entirely deranged by a subterranean railway. The truth is, that except in the City, and there but imperfectly, the inhabitants of the metropolis have no means of expressing their opinion collectively or of being collectively consulted about matters which most intimately concern their social comfort and health. Whether the appointment of municipalities would afford a sufficient remedy

for the evils at present so obvious and so discreditable to our taste and practical sagacity, may be fair matter of doubt. They are certainly less rife in all places where a Corporation is entrusted with the care of the town, and with some superintendence over its buildings and architectural arrangements. We can only say that the plan of the Commissioners affords so reasonable a prospect of success that we are very anxious to see it tried. We give it in the words of the Commissioners themselves :—

‘With the single exception of London, the local government of every considerable town in the United Kingdom is vested in a municipal corporation. This government is not confined to a portion of the town, but, since the recent statutory reforms, comprehends its entire circuit. In London, however, as we have already seen, the municipal government extends over only a small portion of the entire town, whether measured by area or by population. If it were held that municipal institutions were not suited to a metropolitan city, no reason could be found, except its antiquity and existence, for maintaining the Corporation of London, even with its present limited area. It appears to us, however, that a metropolitan city requires, for its own local purposes, municipal institutions not less than other towns. We believe indeed that the utility of municipal institutions is greater, and their want more felt, in a large, populous, opulent, and crowded metropolis, than in a country town of less size, population, and wealth. Those functions of local government, moreover, which in other towns are performed by the municipal authorities, are, in the metropolis, actually discharged by parochial functionaries, or by boards created by local acts, though they may be discharged in a less uniform and efficient manner. In some cases, indeed, in the parishes on the outskirts of the metropolis, they may, from a want of powers in the general law, be left for a time altogether unprovided for, to the serious inconvenience of the inhabitants, and to the permanent injury of the owners of property within the district. We may refer to the evidence of a deputation of the vestry of S. Pancras, appended to our Report, as illustrating the evils which now arise in large parishes where new building is in progress on a large scale, from the absence of an efficient municipal organization, applicable to new portions of the town as they successively spring into existence.

‘Although the City of London is the only part of the metropolis which possesses a municipal organization, there are at present within the metropolitan district seven Parliamentary boroughs, each of which, with the exception of Greenwich, contains a larger number of inhabited houses, and a larger population, than the City, as appears from the subjoined statement:—

**HOUSES AND POPULATION IN 1851 IN THE METROPOLITAN
BOROUGHES.**

Boroughs.	Inhabited Houses.	Population.
Finsbury	37,427	323,772
Marylebone	40,513	370,957
Tower Hamlets	75,710	539,111
Westminster	24,755	241,611
Lambeth	39,154	251,345
Southwark	23,751	172,863
Greenwich	15,401	105,784

	Inhabited Houses.	Population.
City of London	14,693	129,128

‘Of those seven boroughs five received the right of returning members to Parliament under the Reform Act of 1832, and we concur in the opinion expressed by the Lord Mayor, in his evidence given before our Commission, that “as the Legislature has already decided to enfranchise other portions of the metropolis as Parliamentary boroughs, the Legislature ought to complete the work by enfranchising them for municipal purposes also.” (Question 7, 196). We think, indeed, that if an attempt were made to give a municipal organization to the entire metropolis, by a wider extension of the present boundaries of the City, the utility of the present Corporation, as an institution suited to its present limited area, would be destroyed; while, at the same time, a municipal administration of an excessive magnitude, and therefore ill adapted to the wants of the other parts of the metropolis, would be created. But we see no reason why the benefit of municipal institutions should not be extended to the rest of the metropolis, by its division into municipal districts, each possessing a municipal government of its own. What the form of this government should be, and what should be the number or extent of the districts, are questions not lying within the scope of our Commission, and upon which we are not competent to express any opinion. We recommend, at the same time, that the slight municipal connexion which now subsists between Southwark and the City of London be dis severed; and that some small spaces included within the external boundaries of the City, but not forming a part of it, be annexed to it.

‘We may be permitted here to remark, that the power of petition to the Crown for the grant of a municipal corporation, given to Parliamentary boroughs by the Municipal Corporations Act, and by the Act of 1 Vict. c. 78, does not appear to us to be practically applicable to the metropolis. In order that a proper division of the metropolis into municipal districts should be effected, it would be necessary to take a connected view of its different parts, and to arrange the boundaries and size of each district with reference to the other districts. Without such mutual adjustments, a proper combination of districts would be impossible; and such adjustments could not be made, if charters were granted singly to Parliamentary boroughs. If a distribution of the metropolis into municipal districts is to be made, it ought, as it seems to us, to be made simultaneously, and with a due consideration of the manner in which the interests of each part are affected by the general plan.

‘In the event of a division of the entire metropolis, such as we have ventured to indicate, being hereafter made by the authority of Parliament, we suggest the creation of a Metropolitan Board of Works, to be composed of a very limited number of members deputed to it from the council of each metropolitan municipal body, including the Corporation of the City. We propose that the management of public works, in which the metropolis has a common interest, should be conducted by this body. At present works of this sort can only be undertaken either by the Corporation of London from its own peculiar funds, or under powers created for the purpose by special legislation, or by the executive Government out of Parliamentary grants. The only fund arising from metropolitan taxation is the coal-tax, a large part of which is, as we have already seen, devoted to metropolitan improvements, under the control either of the Commissioners of Works, or the Corporation of London. We have already explained the origin and nature of that tax, and we pointed out the objections to which its present application is liable; but we reserved our recommendation respecting it for a subsequent part of our Report. We now recommend in the event of a Metropolitan Board of Works being created, that the entire proceeds of the coal-tax, including the 4*d*. tax now payable to the City, be transferred

to its administration, at the earliest period which may be found practicable; and that they remain under that control after the year 1862, in case the coal tax should be prolonged. When that year has arrived, the London Bridge Approaches fund would be broken up; and we think that the fees on freedoms and apprentices payable to this fund ought to be abolished; and that the small duty on wine which now forms a portion of it should, if continued, be added to the fund for maintaining the port of London. We would add, that in the event of a transfer of the 4*d.* coal duty being made in the manner indicated, the compensation for the sea coal meters, and the loan for the Cannon-street improvement, ought to be a continuing charge upon that tax. It is, however, we think, incumbent on the Corporation to provide a sinking fund for the annual discharge of a portion of the loan borrowed for that improvement.

'We propose further, that the Metropolitan Board of Works should be empowered to levy a rate upon the entire metropolis, for any improvement of general utility, within a certain poundage, to be fixed by Act of Parliament. The present poor-rate assessment of the metropolis (according to the limits of the Registrar-General), is nearly 10,000,000*l.*; and a penny rate upon this amount would produce 41,666*l.* Looking to the unequal incidence of the coal-tax, and to the dissatisfaction which it creates in the district over which it is levied, we strongly incline to the opinion that, even if it should not be thought expedient to disturb the existing arrangement before 1862, yet that it will be held advisable to abolish it from that period, and to substitute for it a rate levied upon the whole metropolis, and payable either by the owner or the occupier, or by both in some fixed proportion. If it should not then be thought expedient to renew the coal-tax, as we think probable, we take for granted that the 4*d.* duty now levied on behalf of the City would cease at the same time.

'It is manifest that a power of executing public works of general metropolitan importance, such as the construction of bridges over the Thames, or the opening or widening of main lines of street, accompanied by a power of metropolitan taxation, would, though founded on a basis of popular election, require efficient safeguards for its prudent and useful exercise. We therefore think that the plans for the works to be executed should be submitted to a Committee of the Privy Council, and its consent obtained before they are carried into effect. We may add, that cases may arise where public works may be executed in the metropolis, partly out of the metropolitan fund, and partly from Parliamentary grants, and that in these cases a control of the executive Government such as we have proposed would be indispensable.'

We are almost inclined to regret that the Commissioners did not proceed to more detailed suggestions, and copy more closely, with certain obvious limitations, the system of municipal administration which is found to work so well in Paris. There the Prefect of the Seine, who is the municipal and general administrator of the commune of Paris in all things which have no direct political bearing; the Prefect of Police, who is in fact the executive officer of the Minister of the Interior, and might have great political power; the Municipal Council, who discuss all plans and find the money for them by levying local taxes; and the Mayors of the twelve districts of Paris, who are subject to the Prefect of the Seine; are all appointed directly by the Government, and removable by the Government at pleasure. This would

be objectionable in this country, and by no means required, except that the Metropolitan Police should clearly be in the hands of the Executive. But there really seems no reason why the whole of the architecture, the sewerage, the water-service, the gas, the paving, the markets, bridges, and all cognate matters within the metropolis, should not, as at Paris, be subject to the control of a single municipal Council. In Paris it is appointed by the Government, in London, it might be appointed by the people, and being appointed by them, might be safely trusted with their comforts and their funds. In Paris the Government has the initiative in all propositions, the Council having only a veto, probably under the present Emperor not even that; in London the Council might initiate, the Government retaining the power of veto, to be used whenever they saw occasion. So only we are convinced will combined and comprehensive improvements ever be effected, so only will the interests of all claims of the population of this great city be properly consulted. The minister who should really initiate and carry a plan for the effectual social government of London might improve upon the boast of Augustus, that he found Rome brick and left it marble; for he might say with truth that he had found London a confused and amorphous agglomeration of hamlets, and that he had left it a vast organized and harmonious city.

We have wandered far away from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council, and have already transgressed the bounds of an article, and far exceeded the limits of our reader's patience; but we will say in conclusion, that the Corporation will not have existed in vain, nor will even their shortcomings be without their use, if they have given occasion to the first rudiments of a system which may end in making the external splendours of London in some degree answerable to its inexhaustible wealth, and in rendering it not only the largest, the most populous and the richest, but also the most magnificent and beautiful of the capitals of the world.

NOTICES.

Mr. E. G. BRUTON has already published a 'Paper read before the Oxford Architectural Society, on Private Halls,' (J. H. Parker.) This certainly looks like working the Oxford Reform Bill. Mr. Bruton calculates that a Hall for forty students might be built for 6,000*l.*; and in the present scheme he furnishes ground plans: his suggestions are sensible enough.

Mr. Meyrick has printed in an Italian translation his careful excerpts from Cosin and other accredited writers, on the true character, ritual and discipline of the Church of England: its title is '*Della Religione Disciplina e Riti Sacri della Chiesa Anglicana*,' &c. Parker is the Oxford and London publisher; and it may be had of Bossange, in Paris, and Biava in Turin. We recommend it to continental tourists, as the work to be placed in the hands of those who are ignorant of the Church of England: on the whole, we should say that it may, in certain quarters, profitably displace Miss Cunningham's kind offices.

Mr. Smyttan has published some verses much more euphonious than his surname—'*Florum Sacra*,' (J. H. Parker,) which are much above the average. The subject is the delightful one of the ecclesiastical symbolism and associations of the '*lilies of the field*.'

The Channel Islands are stepping-stones towards France, in position and in language alike. They might become a medium through which France might learn a little more than she knows at present of England and the English. We are glad to see that a Magazine, simple, sound, and cheap—'*L'Ami de la Religion*'—has sprung up in Jersey, printed in the French language, and conducted on English Church principles. It will, we hope, fall in with other efforts which are being made to dissipate the dense ignorance which exists abroad relative to Anglican Church claims, while its immediate use will be to supply wholesome reading to the natives of Jersey. It will doubtless command a limited circulation in England likewise.

Dr. Waddington, Dean of Durham, has reprinted (Murray) some lucubrations on the '*Greek Church*,' which might have slept in the silence where they have reposed since 1829. The Dean thinks highly of his political sagacity in the suggestion that the Danubian provinces should have been committed to the tutelage of Austria. Some interesting and nicely written letters on the Strophades are the best part of this little volume.

The Bishop of Exeter's '*Pastoral Letter*' (Murray) is among the author's most important contributions to theology. Though occasional in form, it will outlive the melancholy cause which made it necessary:

Rising with the gravity of his subject, the writer throws off, with a proud disdain, an ignoble subject of controversy; and if we miss some of the point of previous publications, the serenity and dignity of the composition more than atone for it. Like the great poet's Ulysses, the Bishop of Exeter—

‘ Though
He is not now, that strength which in old days
Moved earth and heaven—that which he is, he is :
The equal temper of the heroic heart,
Weaker by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.’

Mr. Chenevix Trench's well-known work on Words, which we have already welcomed in these pages, showed him a thinker eminently qualified for discussing the nicer inflections of language. His ‘Synonyms of the New Testament’ (Macmillan) reach us in the form of a set of King's College Lectures; and both in scholarship and spirit they are creditable alike to the lecturer and his class.

Mr. Maurice's ‘Ecclesiastical Lectures,’ delivered to the same body, (Macmillan,) reach us so late in the quarter that we can only announce their publication.

There is nothing very novel in Mr. West's ‘Figures and Types of the Old Testament,’ (Masters,) but there is much that is amiable, sober, and reverential.

‘Poor Paddy's Cabin,’ (Wertheim,) is the production of an Irishman, who thinks that after the parables of Holy Scripture, comes first Bunyan, and then Mrs. Stowe. He only affects the third place. We do not propose to dispute his claims.

‘Vestiges of Divine Vengeance,’ (Wertheim,) is a succinct and comprehensive epitome of all that is known of the Dead Sea and its shores. The main object of Mr. W. E. Tyler's compilation was to make M. de Saulcy's discoveries more widely known, discoveries which we think are somewhat exaggerated. M. de Saulcy does not give the slightest archæological data for identifying the style or age of what he vaguely calls ‘the ruins’ of Gomorrha.

We find in ‘Quelques Mots par un Chrétien Orthodoxe sur les Communions Orientales,’ (Paris: Meyrueis,) a pamphlet which affects to be written by a Member of the Russian Church. If it be so, it is the first work which we remember emanating from the Oriental Communion which treats the schism between East and West, and the relations of the Reformed Communions together, in language and spirit departing from the old stereotyped antiquarian style. A Russian Montalembert or Du Maistre is a phenomenon.

Among Mr. Van Voorst's many beautiful books, none exceeds, we know not if any equals, the delicate beauty of Mr. Gosse's, ‘The Aquarium.’ The

writer, already most favourably known to the scientific and popular student; describes in this charming volume the processes by which he collects and preserves alive the mollusks and sea anemones, and kindred creatures, which in their cozy glass cases, those miniature ocean caves and jungles, form such a delightful spectacle in the Zoological Gardens. The cheapness and facility by which such an ornament of our rooms can be managed surprises us. The illustrations are of ravishing beauty—quite miracles of the art of tinted lithography. We know that this is high praise: but we cannot speak with less moderation on the subject. We have often had occasion to congratulate Mr. Gosse on his reverential style: we can therefore afford to say that he occasionally reflects—always, we admit, piously and nicely—over much.

'Points of War,' (Macmillan,) is the singular, perhaps affected, title of four most striking little poems by Mr. Franklin Lushington. They appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*, and have attracted much notice. They propose a musical as well as rhythmical effect. The 'Fleet under Sail' is an extraordinary little poem.

'Notanda, or, Things to be Remembered,' is the title of a useful tract published by Masters. It is a convenient because small compendium of doctrine, plainly and carefully compiled. It has been assailed in a wonderful tract No. 1. of 'Remarks,' by Rev. Thomas Whalley of Guernsey; and it has been defended by its author in a 'Letter in Defence, &c.' (Masters;) as well as by a Tract, 'The Truth of Things to be Remembered vindicated, &c.' (Masters.) Mr. Whalley does not approve the writings of Bishop Andrewes, and as Mr. Whalley wishes this to be known, we announce the fact on his behalf.

'Susanna,' and 'Ruth Osborne,' (Masters,) will be found convenient little gift-books for poor schools.

'The Old Black Oak,' (Skeffington,) is a conversation between a Lincolnshire Rector and a bit of bog oak. The Rector inquires whether Cain took refuge under the said oak when it was growing, also whether 'sweet birds of paradise did sing among thy topmost branches, and plume their feathers mid thy rich foliage?' We regret to say that the oak's communicativeness is not equal to the reverend querist's creditable spirit of inquiry.

Mr. Caswell's 'Western World Revisited,' (J. H. Parker,) is a reprint of the well-known letters which he forwarded, as 'our own correspondent,' to one of the daily papers when visiting the United States and Canada, as one of the deputation sent by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel to the American Board of Missions. The writer has done more in a simple, earnest, untiring way to bring the English and American Churches together than any man in England.

We cannot say much for 'Songs for the Church,' (Clarke;) they are rough and unelegant and homely: but they are, what much better verses often are not, readable.

A most convenient little series of Oxford classics, mere text books for the Lecture Room, is in course of publication by Mr. J. H. Parker. They

admirably supersede, and are cheaper than the vile Tauchnitz abominations of our own youth: at present the set only comprises the texts of the Greek Tragedians. Not being possessed of the classical fervour of Parson Adams, who always carried *Æschylus* in his pocket, may we ask for a Latin series?

We can promise young people who, like ourselves, relish 'The Conceited Pig' and other sage apologues of that sort, an immense treat in 'Stories on Proverbs,' (Mozley.) The title is not very happy: but the book is extremely funny and pleasant. We are strong enough to confess that we were weak enough to read this majestic volume quite through: and we suspect that the gravest of our readers, if we can persuade him to begin it, will do the same. The fact is, that very great art and skill is required, not only to make mice and owls and cocks and hens discourse in owl talk and the rest of it, but to discriminate in a mouse family, and to give each his or her special character. Pig character is one thing: but shading and tinting in the moral physiognomy of porklings is a rare acquirement. The present writer can do this.

'Consecration *versus* Desecration,' (Bell,) is the title of a very strong, yet respectful, remonstrance addressed to the Bishop of London, by one who obviously has both the right and power to speak strongly, on the plan for pulling down the City Churches.

'Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania,' (Masters.) By the Rev. Robert Milman. The author of this little work is already not unknown to the public. To general literature he has contributed a *Life of Tasso*; to religion, several graceful allegories, and one or two devotional books. In the present volume, which gives an account of 'perhaps the most successful mission ever attempted and accomplished,' the historic and religious elements combine. The author has evidently taken great pains to collect all possible materials to make his history—for such, notwithstanding some slight interweaving of fiction, it really is—as complete as possible. To avoid, he tells us, all modern controversies, the narrative is supposed to come from the pen of Bernard, a monk, who, to console himself for the entire failure of his own labours in the same field, undertakes to give an account of the complete success attending the preaching of Otto, the rich, magnificent, yet personally self-denying Prince Bishop of Bamberg, high in favour with the Emperor Henry IV. Otto, instructed by Bernard's failure—a failure chiefly attributable to the contempt of the wealthy Pomeranians for his poverty (the poor monk had literally gone without purse or scrip)—takes measures to ensure a hearing, to attract notice and respect, and to satisfy the suspicious heathen that he has come seeking not theirs but them. So he comes with plenty of money, a numerous train of ecclesiastics and knights, materials for building and furnishing sumptuous churches. Of course, it is impossible in the limits of a notice to give even a sketch of the gradual steps by which Otto adds Pomerania to Christendom. His first immediate, almost miraculous success, crowned by the destruction with his own hand of the image of the chief false god Triglav, in his temple of Stettin; the rage of the heathen hierarchy, headed by Primislav, the

chief priest, almost as powerful in Pomerania as the temporal government, and their vain attempts to support their failing cause by pious frauds; the numerous apostasies, and in many places open re-establishment of idolatry, when Otto returns for a while to Bamberg, and great temporal calamities came on the people, ascribed, of course, by the heathen priests to the anger of the forsaken gods; the return and final triumph of Otto, when at last he wins to Christianity Mitslav, one of the most powerful nobles, who had long remained constant to the heathen party, (though even in Bernard's time he had protected the Christian missionaries from personal violence,) not so much from conviction as for love of Illah, the fair daughter of the high-priest, herself a priestess of Laden the Beautiful, goddess of Spring and of Love: the history of all this is well told, and will abundantly repay perusal. The two scenes in which the heathen priests have recourse to their pious frauds, which, of course, like all frauds, pious or otherwise, shamefully recoil on their own heads, are of dramatic interest. We specially recommend, too, the very striking account of the overwhelming temporal calamities that fall on the hitherto wealthy and prosperous Pomeranians, in the first year of their conversion, and the consequent numerous apostasies, to the consideration of those who see in national prosperity a sure sign of God's favour. The artifice of ascribing the narrative to Bernard is we think a failure. The Benedictine monk by no means conceals the Berkshire vicar. No one could for a moment give a mediæval religious credit for so calm and thoughtful a history as this, in which miracles, though by no means ignored, yet play a very undistinguished part, while the Blessed Virgin and saints are scarce ever mentioned, and the allusions to the Pope are of the remotest and vaguest kind. Perhaps, however, failure in the dramatic respect will not seriously affect the popularity and usefulness which 'Mitslav' deserves on other than artistic grounds.

Archbishop Whately has compiled, and Mr. J. W. Parker has published, a volume styled 'Remains of the late Bishop Copleston.' A creditable memoir of this respectable prelate had already appeared under the able but discriminating editorship of a near relation of the late Bishop. With this publication Dr. Whately is plainly dissatisfied: he is only thankful for the memoirs of any of his friends, so far as they illustrate his own life and writings. Dr. Whately has no objection to the portraits of his contemporaries and familiars; but every one of them must be depicted standing in ecstatic worship of Dr. Whately. Dr. Whately, we believe, has a full appreciation for all the literary remains of his Oriel friends, but then they must be those remains which enshrine or reflect the one beloved image of Dr. Whately himself. Dr. Whately surveys the whole world of thought and science with large and liberal glance: but it is not so much to inform and expand his own mind, as to detect all the points in which nature and learning illustrate and confirm the great Whatelean dicta. Aristotle and Bacon were the interpreters of nature: letters and books and men are noticeable and patronised only as they pay a deferential homage to and interpret the oracular sayings of the Archbishop of Dublin. It is with this broad

view of men and things that Dr. Whately has composed his *Remains* of Dr. Copleston. The proper title of the book would have been, 'Scraps of Whately with Copleston Sauce.' Dr. Whately quotes himself and his own numerous publications in the following pages of the volume before us:—in the Preface, p. vi.; p. 18, a quotation of nine pages from an unpublished manuscript of Dr. Whately; p. 35 *bis*; p. 48, a quotation of three pages; p. 51; p. 55; p. 56 *bis*; p. 57; pp. 58—63, five pages from another unpublished MS. epistle of Dr. Whately; p. 73; p. 75; p. 81; p. 83; p. 84, (four references to the *Opera Whateleiana*;) p. 89 *bis*; p. 92. At p. 96 commence the 'Remains' in the shape of 'Extracts' [very common-place indeed] 'from Dr. Copleston's Common-Place Book.' This Common-Place Book was, Dr. Whately informs us, 'transmitted at Dr. Copleston's desire to him as a bequest, with an evident design on his part that Dr. Whately should publish any portion of it which he considered generally interesting.' Now waiving the preliminary question, whether Bp. Copleston did not unwisely trust to his friend's friendship, and whether he intended to do more than to commit worthless adversaria to pious hands for incremation, it requires but small knowledge of Dr. Whately's character to anticipate the principle of selection which he would adopt. The object was to get together 'interesting extracts:' what on earth can be so interesting to the sons of men as Dr. Whately, and Dr. Whately's writings? Here is a convenient test and standard: what relates to, quotes, consults, praises, illustrates, or bows down to, Whately, is interesting. On this principle Bp. Copleston's Common-Place Book was consulted, on this principle it was eviscerated. The extracts from it only reach to twenty-five pages: but these twenty-five pages are illustrated by seven or eight apposite remarks from Dr. Whately, and one reference to Dr. Hinds. A dozen Sermons complete the 'Remains of Bishop Copleston,' and in editing these Archbishop Whately only quotes himself in the foot-notes thirteen times. The sum of the whole is that Dr. Whately quotes himself forty-one times in the volume. By way of specimen of the choicer and more instructive items of biography and contemporaneous history, with which Dr. Whately has enriched the memoir of his guide, philosopher, and friend, we extract the first fact on which the Archbishop expatiates:—'It is rather a curious coincidence that Bp. Copleston received the baptismal name of Edward; certainly without any reference to Oriel College, of which he afterwards became so distinguished an ornament, which college was founded by King Edward II.' As though one were to say, it is rather curious that Dr. Whately's name is Richard, certainly without any reference to Richard Crookback or Dick Turpin.

Mr. Tuckerman, an American traveller, has printed 'A Month in England,' (Bentley,) which has attracted quite as much praise as it deserves. Most of it is got up from 'Cunningham's Hand-Book of London,' the 'Oxford Guide,' and the like esoteric authorities. Mr. Tuckerman has made an awful mess of his sentiment, by going into great raptures at the Blue-Coat School, while idealizing the memories of Charterhouse worthies. He has confounded the two schools, and probably saw neither. *Ex. grat.* 'In that chamber [in the square of Christ's Hospital] the devout Baxter

expired,' p. 33. He died in Charterhouse Yard. Addison and Steele, Wesley and Barrow, all of whom Mr. Tuckerman surveys in his mind's eye pacing the Newgate Street cloisters, were at the Charterhouse, not at Christ's Hospital. Stillingfleet practised his first rhetoric at Cranbourne, in Dorsetshire, and not at the Blue Coat School. Blackstone was educated at the Charterhouse. Gazing up at the enormous roof of the hall of the same Christ's hospital, Mr. Tuckerman was reminded of C. Lamb's story of the donkey imprisoned on it: only the said hall was not built in Lamb's time. Mr. Tuckerman only seems to have gone to Church once during his month; and imagines that the supplications for the Queen are peculiar to S. George's Chapel, Windsor. He also opines that we ought not to beg for her Majesty's health and *wealth*, because the Gospel discourages riches. At Oxford Mr. Tuckerman is immensely pleased with the acacia-tree in front of Dr. Routh's lodgings at Magdalen: so pleased, indeed, that he invests it with tropical beauties, and spells it a 'cassia-tree.'

Mr. Cecil Wray's touching Memoir of Mr. Hughes, (Masters,) a young clergyman of promise, forms an agreeable volume: the subject is, however, hardly strong enough for biography.

'Hospitals and Sisterhoods,' (Murray,) groups together in a full and complete form, and with an excellent tone, all that recommends the revival and expansion of such institutions among ourselves.

The war has, of course, brought out a vast amount of religious writing: Tracts, Sermons, (chiefly preached on the Fast Day,) and disquisitions on and applications of unfulfilled prophecy. Among the Sermons, as sound and good, we may specify:—1. Mr. Acton Warburton's, preached at Iffley, (J. H. Parker.) 2. Mr. H. Newland's, a vigorous one, at Westbourne, (Masters.) 3. A remarkably eloquent one by Mr. E. Miller, preached at Bognor. 4. One by Mr. Sowter, (J. H. Parker.) 5. Mr. Kempe's at S. James's, (Skeffington.) 6. Mr. Gowring's, better than the average, at Banbury, (Masters.) 7. By Mr. Beamish, at Conduit Street, (Bosworth.) 'The Great Wine Press, popularly called Armageddon,' (Strange,) is a specimen of the coarse fanatical froth which a tormenting period of society brings up.

Of Sermons we have to acknowledge, 1. Kebbel's 'Harmony of the Sacraments,' (Bell.) 2. Huxtable's, preached at Wells before the Theological College, (J. W. Parker.) 3. Hugo's on 'The Lord's Prayer,' (Rivingtons;) and, 4, an admirable volume by Bishop Armstrong, (J. H. Parker.)

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1854.

ART. I.—*History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V.* By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. London: John Murray.

THE design of this work is to give a history of Christianity in the West, from its first origin to the latter part of the fifteenth century; when printing, the revival of letters, and Greek literature, produced a new world, intellectually, in Europe.

The three volumes now published bring down the history as far as the end of the twelfth century, when, after a series of strange reverses, the papal authority was fully established. The remainder of the work the author hopes to publish shortly.

The early portion of the history goes in part over the same ground as the History of Christianity down to the fall of Paganism, but is devoted more especially to the history of the Church of the West during that period; and particularly to those points which, in the author's opinion, influenced the development of the characteristic views and tone of religion manifested in the Latin Churches.

In several respects this history is likely to be much more interesting and more popular than Dr. Milman's former work. It is not concerned with a portion of Christian history which formed a prominent feature of that book—the life of our Lord, and the first beginnings of the Christian religion, recorded in the New Testament; so that the views of the writer are not brought into such painful collision with those of his readers as they were in each of his former histories. Again, the materials for the work are much more ample. We pass from the first centuries, of which the records are scanty, to those of which they are abundant, minute, and copious; and though the later ages may not be equal in point of Christian interest with the earlier, they have a special interest in their connexion with ourselves, and with the state in which Christianity came to us, and has been established among us. We read the history of the

foundation of our own Churches, and become acquainted with those ages into the treasures of whose teaching we have entered. Besides, this period will be found to afford great scope, and varied materials for those pictures and descriptions which the author produces so successfully, and opportunities for introducing abundant episodes of the most interesting kind, which set off the main subject when its own intrinsic interest is not great.

The history before us is not a philosophical history. The writer does not thoroughly and deeply trace the causes of the great facts of which he treats, or follow up the workings of the spirit of each age to its original springs; nor, again, is it a full narrative of facts. If you take any ordinary period of the history, and select the narrative of a writer the bulk of whose work would lead you to expect as copious a detail of events in the one as in the other, and compare the two, you learn less of what actually occurred from the History of the Dean of S. Paul's, than from writers whose works are in themselves less able and interesting than his. His work is not a chart, in which each point is set down in due proportion and exactness, but a series of pictures, so to say, of the country which it would describe. It is for this kind of composition that the poetical and somewhat gorgeous style of the author seems particularly to qualify him. Of course it is plain that such a composition is much the most interesting to the general reader. No one would think of taking up Gieseler as a book of pleasant reading; neither would one make that of Dr. Milman a book of reference for full and exact information. Indeed we think that this character has been carried so far as to destroy the due proportions of the history; so that the work assumes the character of a series of illustrations. In the portions, indeed, of history which it does undertake to represent fully, it is very exact and detailed. On the other hand, it omits facts, and passes very slightly over periods, which appear to be less suited for interesting narrative. Some series of events are set forth with the utmost fulness of detail—detail which adds interest to the narrative and vividness to the picture. But, to take one instance, there is no account of the circumstances of the introduction of the clause *Filioque* into the Creed, important as the fact is doctrinally in the history of the Latin Church in its relation to the Greek; whilst the controversies that occupied the Greek Church, and in which the Latins were only incidentally engaged, are treated with great fulness. Indeed, the points of doctrine and discipline, in which the Latins and Greeks are contrasted, are scarcely alluded to.

This history then has the defects, as well as the advantages, of such a kind of composition. The maker of a chart is bound to lay down in due proportion every place that comes within

any given line of importance. But the painter—one who would illustrate a country—selects his subject: he seizes the interesting objects; he passes hastily through dry, uniform tracts of country; he rarely draws the wide heath or the dull flat: whole districts are omitted, or are exhibited only in the dim remote distance of his picture, setting off the more engaging objects. Thus he selects the subject, and in handling that subject he chooses his own position towards it. Faithfulness, indeed, requires that his pictures should not only be individually truthful, but that collectively they should give a fair idea of the country; but yet in each he may take his own point of view. The lights and shades are thrown as they will best please the eye, or bring out those features of the landscape that are most telling. Some objects stand out in vivid reality; others are thrown into the shade, and are as if they were not. Of some portions, each minute detail is worked up with the utmost care, whilst others exhibit scarcely any distinct features. Thus the present historian has been most exact in his working out of particular points. Mahommedanism is traced from its first commencement, and the life and system of the false prophet beautifully described. The contentions on various points of doctrine—the Monothelite and Iconoclastic—which chiefly belong to the history of the Greek Church, are dwelt on at great length, and with great copiousness of detail. The history of Christianity in our own country, especially the history of S. Thomas of Canterbury, is portrayed with a fulness which neither its interest to ourselves, nor (which is the reason assigned in the latter case) its being so remarkable an exhibition of the religious temper of the age, does so well account for as the fact that they afforded good subjects for description, and studies most interesting to the reader. In all these cases the minuteness of detail is what gives the truth, reality, and beauty, to the narrative. We do not quarrel with it; we have enjoyed reading it; but it is plain that, in a history extending over twelve centuries, very much must be passed over lightly to allow so large a space for these special subjects. While Becket's history is drawn out with this elaborate handling, that of Lanfranc and Anselm is barely touched on.

But this pictorial character makes Dr. Milman's history more generally engaging and likely to interest his readers, and it is as a decoy to the study of Church history that we think it is likely to prove most valuable, especially to that of the Middle Ages.

These volumes give a charm to a period of the Church's history which is generally but little studied, and too often regarded as a desert. The common practice of ordinary theological students was (perhaps still is) to read the Church History

of the first three or four centuries, and then to pass on to that of the Reformation. They took the portions of the Church's existence the decisions of which are regarded as authoritative. The intervening portion—a thousand or twelve hundred years, the greater portion of the duration of our religion—was neglected; and, because it was neglected and unknown, was supposed to be unprofitable.

It is through this supposed desert that Dean Milman leads us, and shows us that it is really a country full of fair scenes and objects of deep interest. The impression given by the bare recital of barbarian inroads—the long, puzzling, uninteresting successions of the Merovingian, and, except the noble founders of the house, of the Carolingian princes—lists of Popes who have nothing to distinguish them—the aspect under which the history of this period is usually presented, simply deters one from engaging in it, and persons turn away from it as a fruitless study. The History before us shows that this is an unfair impression: that that long range of years has objects of great beauty, noble characters, stirring events, strange intricacies of plots, great and unlooked-for changes for good and evil. Thus an interest is thrown over the period which, to general readers, it did not possess before.

And it is a period in many respects most instructive. There is a life and energy, a self-devotion, and simple acting out of Christian principles, in the recently converted of the northern nations, which exemplifies what Christians should be. The labours, the zeal, the course of proceeding adopted by the missionaries, are full of instruction; and in one respect the study of this portion of Church history is most especially necessary—in that it exhibits the original of the present relation of the Church and the civil power.

We study the history of the Church while the civil governments of the world were heathen, and the Christians were persecuted; as soon as we come to the time when the Church was established—to a condition of things parallel to and capable of comparison with our own—we leave it. The consequence is obvious: we only see the primitive Christians in their state of independence and separation from, or antagonism to, the civil power; we are in danger of either inferring hastily that we ought to act in the same manner, and learning nothing else than lessons of independence and antagonism—or of concluding that the condition of things at present is so different that no inference can be drawn from those times to our own, and hence acquiescing in a fusion of the Church in the State. But the history of the Church in the centuries that follow the establishment of Christianity as the recognised religion of the State, is fruitful in every form of warning, and example, and suggestion. We may

see almost every form of relation arising between Church and State; we can trace the consequences to which they led; we can study the arguments on which they were maintained. Nay, more, we see what varied forms of this relation are compatible with the Church's life, have retarded, or stimulated and advanced it. We may here test our theories by experience—too often a sad and melancholy experience, it is true, but yet the more calculated to save us from despairing under difficulties, or imagining that the Church has lost her vitality or her power because she does not yet enjoy her freedom.

How infinitely valuable are the lessons which those ten or twelve centuries teach us! The struggles, the depression, the seeming failure, of the cause of truth and goodness—its revival in increased energy, and life, and power.

Yet these most useful fields of instruction are commonly unexamined. Some slight sketch, some brief compendium, some meagre list of names and dates, is regarded as sufficient—a mere verbal acquaintance with it, without at all entering into the realities of the life of those who existed in those days, their views or actions, reverses or successes.

The volumes before us are well fitted to work a change in this respect among general readers. They are themselves interesting and attractive—and show how much there is worth knowing in the Church history of those ages. The style of composition adopted specially fits them for this use. The language is always graceful, often eloquent; though tending to over-gorgeousness of diction, and to a uniform brilliancy, which detracts much from the effect, as well as from the clearness of the style.

There is another characteristic of the author's mode of treating the subject, which, however distasteful it may be to our feelings, and in a certain sense unfair, has its use. He looks on the subject from without, and writes the history of Christianity in a critical and judicial attitude, which is as though it were apart from the society of whose fate he treats.

Hence the subject is not treated as ecclesiastical history usually is. It deals much more largely with the general history of the times; and endeavours to represent persons and events, not as viewed by the members of the Church themselves, but as seen by the world. Prevalent faults and evils are put prominently in view; sometimes—as it would seem for the sake of giving weight to the view less generally received—too prominently. But this mode of treatment has its advantages, if it be kept in mind that it is only a view of one side of the subject. We need to have such a view presented to us.

Ecclesiastical history, generally speaking, is exclusively ecclesiastical. It is treated as a special branch of history, like the

history of an order or philosophy; it treats of the Christian society and its fortunes, and of other things only in relation to it. But for a true understanding of this history itself—still more for enabling us to apply it to our own use—the Church must be viewed in its relation to the world, and as involved in the world's history. The Church does not simply pass through the world as a disembodied spirit not of the world; it acts on the world, and is acted on by the world. The individual members of which it consists are drawn into it from the mass of mankind, and however they may be moulded by the influence of the Divine Spirit and the truth, which constitute the Church's life, they are still in their measure of the world. The prevalent character of the nation or the age—political changes, revolutions in philosophy, affecting the modes of thought and expression—all have their influence on the Church; and must be known if we would attain a true view of its history. Still more, if we are to derive advantage in our own time from the history of the past, we must know the Church of former ages, in circumstances corresponding to those of the Church of our own days; that is, as in the world, and implicated in the world's doings. One cause of the great mistakes that arise in the study of the lives of holy men, or of the history of the Church as a whole, is this—that the saint is portrayed in his holiness. The defects, the weaknesses, the failings, in which he was like ourselves, are not brought out. We behold the all but perfect exemplar, a model for our imitation, indeed, raising us up to noble aspirations, but not affording us the support of knowing that he is like ourselves, that like ourselves he had to struggle against faults, and had, after all, defects clinging to him. Still less are we shown the process through which he attained his excellence. We see the perfected work before us; and have ourselves to work on the unformed block of material, without guidance, or direction, or experience, in the slow and difficult process by which the effect is to be produced.

So as respects the past ages of the Church. Viewed in the distance, and in the associations attaching to antiquity, what is harsh, and what, if present, would be overwhelmingly evil, is lost sight of. Evils and scandals that seemed intolerable, difficulties that were apparently insuperable—trials, disappointments, reverses, are not perceived. We read of the Church; of its unity and consistency in doctrine; its victories over the world; its exalted saints; the purity, and holiness, and love of its members. We do not see the dark side. Misunderstandings, disputes, quarrels, even among good men—all that form the occasions of our own special trials and difficulties—the being thwarted in their endeavours when they are seeking to do good, and sacrificing their lives to that end; long labours undergone in attaining

their ends, disappointments occurring by the way, and disappointments coming at the last; life-long struggles, mutual distrust, misrepresentation of conduct, and imputation of bad motives:—the same troubles which are now the lot of those who are willing to leave the calm and too often the selfish quiet of doing only their own work, for the service of God and His truth, have been the portion of good men in all times.

But most of all, and most dangerously, are we deceived when we frame to ourselves an ideal of what the Church of Christ should be—drawing out an image of perfection which never has been, and never is to be, actually realized. Such an ideal is useful if it be set before us as a model towards the attaining and carrying out of which our endeavours should be directed. It is a mistake if we expect ever actually to see it realized, and still more, if, because it is not realized, we relax our energies, or acquiesce in a lower state of things, or despond of doing anything because we cannot do everything, or suppose that a church is not a true church because it does not come up to this ideal. Such an error was that of the Montanists, the Donatists, the various sects which, in the Middle Ages, aimed at purity by severing themselves from the Church. In our own days it leads persons to listen to the claims of Irvingism, or to go over to Rome, or altogether to give up the belief in the Church as a visible Divine institution.

In the great majority of instances among ourselves these errors have clearly arisen from indulging in the dream of finding this ideal perfection of the Church actually realized. The reaction produces a feeling of dissatisfaction with what is actual, and a starting aside, or starting back, into some form of error.

One of the best remedies for this evil is to make oneself acquainted with the state of the Church as it really did exist at any, even at the brightest, periods of its course. A thoughtful study of the Acts of the Apostles or the Epistles of S. Paul, and a realizing the actual condition of the Church in those days, would show us much in this way. And hence it follows that to a right-minded man the study of a history which gives (suppose it) too unfavourable a view of the Church of past times, may prove useful; just as moralists recommend us to make use of calumnies as hints, to aid in discovering our own faults.

When an author brings out the faults of great men—when he seems to us not to entertain a just view of their characters—not to understand them—when he shows that they were not understood by those of their own time—he is but exhibiting that which is the common lot of all; specially of all who rise above the ordinary every-day line of principle and conduct, and are not understood because they are not actuated by the principles that sway the minds of the masses.

Now the view which Dr. Milman takes of the history of Christianity in the world—as it leads generally to fairness in the statement of facts, and impartiality as well as calmness in depicting the opinions and characters of the Christians of former ages, does also somewhat disqualify him from entering into their characters, and realizing the principles that were at work; and gives to his generally impartial mind some bias against those who were earnest in their day in maintaining religious truth, and opposing the practices and principles of the world.

The view we refer to is that respecting the modification of Christianity by the habits of mind and thought—the civilization, information, and intellectual advancement—of the age or country in which it exists. He regards it as so modified that the religion is the fruit of the spirit of the age, and is exactly adapted to the age. Hence certain opinions and practices belong to each age, and any other would be out of place in it. It would seem, indeed, as if there were no truth, and that what each age troweth is truth to that age. That there is some truth—something which constitutes Christianity, simply as such—something which lives in and through all these variations, the author certainly holds; but what it is—how much of what we consider properly Christianity is included in it—he does not state explicitly. He considers the three great forms of Christianity to be the Greek, the Latin, and that which began at the Reformation, Teutonic Christianity; and draws out the characteristics of each form, and contrasts them with each other, at the opening of his work:—

‘Greek Christianity could not be but affected, both in its doctrinal progress and in its polity, by its Greek origin. Among the Greeks had been for centuries agitated all those primary questions which lie at the bottom of all religions:—the formation of the worlds—the existence and nature of the Deity—the origin and cause of evil, though this seems to have been studied even with stronger predilection in the trans-Euphratic East. Hence Greek Christianity was insatiably inquisitive, speculative. Confident in the inexhaustible copiousness and fine precision of its language, it endured no limitation to its curious investigations. As each great question was settled or worn out, it was still ready to propose new ones. It began with the Divinity of Christ (still earlier perhaps with some of the Gnostic Cosmogonical, or Theophanic theories), so onward to the Trinity; it expired, or at least drew near its end, as the religion of the Roman East, discussing the Divine Light on Mount Tabor.

‘In their polity the Grecian Churches were a federation of republics, as were the settlements of the Jews. But they were founded on a religious, not on a national basis; external to, yet in their boundaries, mostly in their aggregative system, following the old commonwealths, which still continued to subsist under the supremacy of the Roman Prefect or Proconsul, and in later times the distribution of the Imperial dioceses. They were held together by common sympathies, common creeds, common sacred books, certain, as yet simple, but common rites, common usages of life, and an hierarchy everywhere, in theory at least, of the same power and

influence. They admitted the Christians of other places by some established sign, or by commendatory letters. They were often bound together by mutual charitable subventions. Still each was an absolutely independent community. The Roman East, including Greece, had no capital. The old kingdoms might respect the traditional greatness of some city, which had been the abode of their kings, or which was the seat of a central provincial government: other cities, from their wealth and population, may have assumed a superior rank, Antioch in Syria, Alexandria in Egypt, Ephesus in Asia Minor. But though churches known or reputed to have been founded by Apostles might be looked on with peculiar respect, there was as yet no subordination, no supremacy; their federal union was a voluntary association. Whether the internal constitution had become more or less rapidly or completely monarchical; whether the Bishop had risen to a greater or less height above his co-Presbyters, the whole episcopal order, the representatives of each church, were on the same level. The Metropolitan, and afterwards the Patriarchal dignity, was of later growth. Jerusalem, which might naturally have aspired to the rank of the Christian capital, at least of the East, had been destroyed, and remained desolate for many years: it assumed only at a later period (at one time it was subject to Cæsarea) even the Patriarchal rank.

‘But at the extinction of Paganism, Greek, or as it may now be called in opposition to the West, Eastern Christianity, had almost ceased to be aggressive or creative. Except the contested conversion of the Bulgarians, later of the Russians, and a few wild tribes, it achieved no conquests. The Nestorians alone, driven into exile by cruel persecutions, formed settlements, and propagated their own form of Christianity in Persia, India, perhaps in still more distant lands. The Eastern Church never recovered the ground which it had lost before the revived Magianism of the Sassanian kings of Persia; and it was compelled to retire within still narrowing bounds before triumphant Mohammedanism. The Greek hierarchy had now lost their unity of action. The great Patriarchates, which by this time had been formed on the authority of Councils, were involved in perpetual strife, or were contested by rival bishops, till three of them, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, sank into administrators of a tolerated religion under the Mohammedan dominion. The Bishop of Constantinople was the passive victim, the humble slave, or the factious adversary of the Byzantine Emperor: rarely exercised a lofty moral control upon his despotism. The lower clergy, whatever their more secret beneficent or sanctifying workings on society, had sufficient power, wealth, rank, to tempt ambition, or to degrade to intrigue; not enough to command the public mind for any great salutary purpose, to repress the inveterate immorality of an effete age; to reconcile jarring interests, to mould together hostile races: in general they ruled, where they did rule, by the superstitious fears, rather than by the reverence and attachment of a grateful people. They sank downward into the common ignorance, and yielded to that worst barbarism—a worn out civilization. Monasticism withdrew a great number of those who might have been energetic and useful citizens into barren seclusion, and religious indolence; but except where the monks formed themselves, as they frequently did, into fierce political or polemic factions, they had little effect on the condition of society. They stood aloof from the world, the anchorites in their desert wildernesses, the monks, in their jealously-barred convents; and secure, as they supposed, of their own salvation, left the rest of mankind to inevitable perdition.

‘Greek theology still maintained its speculative tendency; it went on defining with still more exquisite subtlety the Godhead and the nature of Christ; the interminable controversy still lengthened out, and cast forth

sect after sect from the enfeebled community. The great Greek writers, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, had passed away, and left only unworthy successors; the splendid public eloquence had expired on the lips of Chrysostom. There was no writer who laid strong hold on the imagination or reason of men, except the author of that extraordinary book, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, of which perhaps the remote influence was greater in the West than in the Byzantine empire. John of Damascus, the powerful adversary of Iconoclasm, is a splendid exception, not merely on account of the polemic vigour shown in that controversy, but as a theologian doubtless the ablest of his late age. The Greek language gradually, but slowly, degenerated; at length, but not entirely till after the fall of Constantinople, it broke up into barbarous dialects; but it gave birth by fusion with foreign tongues to no new language productive of noble poetry, of oratory, or philosophy. A rude and premature reformation, that of Iconoclasm, attempted to overthrow the established traditionary faith, but offered nothing to supply its place, which could either enlighten the mind or enliven the religious affections: it destroyed the images, but it did not reveal the Original Deity, or the Christ in his pure and essential spirituality. Greek Christianity remained however, and still remains, a separate and peculiar form of faith; it repudiated all the attempts of the feeblere sovereigns of the East to barter its independence for succour against the formidable Turks: it is still the religion of revived Greece, and of the vast Russian empire.

'Latin Christianity, on the other hand, seemed endowed with an inexhaustible principle of expanding life. No sooner had the Northern tribes entered within its magic circle, than they submitted to its yoke: and, not content with thus conquering its conquerors, it was constantly pushing forward its own frontier, and advancing into the strongholds of Northern Paganism. Gradually it became a monarchy, with all the power of a concentrated dominion. The clergy assumed an absolute despotism over the mind of man: not satisfied with ruling princes and kings, themselves became princes and kings. Their organization was coincident with the bounds of Christendom; they were a second universal magistracy, exercising always equal, asserting, and for a long period possessing, superior power to the civil government. They had their own jurisprudence—the canon law—co-ordinate with and of equal authority with the Roman or the various national codes, only with penalties infinitely more terrific, almost arbitrarily administered, and admitting no exception, not even that of the greatest temporal sovereign. Western Monasticism, in its general character, was not the barren, idly laborious or dreamy quietude of the East. It was industrious and productive: it settled colonies, preserved arts and letters, built splendid edifices, fertilized deserts. If it rent from the world the most powerful minds, having trained them by its stern discipline, it sent them back to rule the world. It continually, as it were, renewed its youth, and kept up a constant infusion of vigorous life, now quickening into enthusiasm, now darkening into fanaticism; and by its perpetual rivalry, stimulating the zeal, or supplying the deficiencies of the secular clergy. In successive ages it adapted itself to the state of the human mind. At first a missionary to barbarous nations, it built abbeys, hewed down forests, cultivated swamps, enclosed domains, retrieved or won for civilization tracts which had fallen to waste or had never known culture. With St. Dominic it turned its missionary zeal upon Christianity itself, and spread as a preaching order throughout Christendom; with St. Francis it became even more popular, and lowered itself to the very humblest of mankind. In Jesuitism it made a last effort to govern mankind by an incorporated caste. But Jesuitism found it necessary to reject many of the pecu-

liarities of Monasticism: it made itself secular to overcome the world. But the compromise could not endure. Over the Indians of South America alone, but for the force of circumstances, it might have been lasting. In Eastern India it became a kind of Christian Paganism: in Europe a moral and religious Rationalism, fatal both to morals and to religion.

‘Throughout this period, then, of at least ten centuries, Latin Christianity was the religion of the Western nations of Europe: Latin the religious language; the Latin translation of the Scriptures the religious code of mankind. Latin theology was alone inexhaustibly prolific, and held wide and unshaken authority. On most speculative tenets this theology had left to Greek controversialists to argue out the endless transcendental questions of religion, and contented itself with resolutely embracing the results, which she fixed in her inflexible theory of doctrine. The only controversy which violently disturbed the Western Church was the practical one, on which the East looked almost with indifference, the origin and motive principle of human action—grace and free will. This, from Augustine to Luther and Jansenius, was the interminable, still reviving problem. Latin Christian literature, like Greek, might have seemed already to have passed its meridian after Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and, high above all, Augustine. The age of true Latin poetry, no doubt, had long been over; the imaginative in Christianity could only find its expression to some extent in the legend and in the ritual; but, except in a very few hymns, it was not till out of the wedlock of Latin with the Northern tongues, not till after new languages had been born in the freshness of youth, that there were great Christian poets: poets not merely writing on religious subjects, but instinct with the religious life of Christianity—Dante, Ariosto, Tasso, Shakspeare, Milton, Calderon, Schiller. But not merely did Latin theology expand into another vast and teeming period, that of the Schoolmen, culminating in Aquinas; but Latin being the common language, the clergy the only learned body throughout Europe, it was that of law, in both its branches; of science, of philosophy, even of history; of letters; in short, of civilization. Latin Christianity, when her time was come, had her great era of art, not only as the preserver of the traditions of Greek and Roman skill in architecture, and some of the technical operations in sculpture and painting, but original and creative. It was art comprehending architecture, painting, sculpture, and music, Christian in its fullest sense, as devoted entirely to Christian uses, expressive of Christian sentiments, arising out of and kindling in congenial spirits Christian thought and feeling.

‘The characteristic of Latin Christianity was that of the old Latin world—a firm and even obstinate adherence to legal form, whether of traditionary usage or written statute; the strong assertion of, and the severe subordination to authority. Its wildest and most eccentric fanaticism, for the most part, and for many centuries, respected external unity. It was the Roman empire, again extended over Europe by an universal code and a provincial government; by an hierarchy of religious prætors or proconsuls, and a host of inferior officers, each in strict subordination to those immediately above them, and gradually descending to the very lowest ranks of society: the whole with a certain degree of freedom of action, but a constrained and limited freedom, and with an appeal to the spiritual Cæsar in the last resort.

‘Latin Christianity maintained its unshaken dominion until, what I venture to call, Teutonic Christianity, aided by the invention of paper and of printing, asserted its independence, threw off the great mass of traditionary religion, and out of the Bible summoned forth a more simple faith, which seized at once on the reason, on the conscience, and on the passions of men. This faith, with a less perfectly organized outward system, has

exercised a more profound moral control, through the sense of strictly personal responsibility. Christianity became a vast influence working irregularly on individual minds, rather than a great social system, coerced by a central supremacy, by an all-embracing spiritual control, and held together by rigid usage, or by outward signs of common citizenship. Its multiplicity and variety, rather than its unity, was the manifestation of its life; or rather its unity lay deeper in its being, and consisted more in intellectual sympathies, in affinities of thought and feeling, of principles and motives, in a more remote or rather untraceable kindred through the common Father and common Saviour. Ceremonial uniformity seemed to retire into subordinate importance and estimation. Books gradually became, as far as the instruction of the human race, a co-ordinate priesthood. No longer rare, costly, inaccessible, or unintelligible, they descended to classes which they had never before approached. Eloquence or argument, instead of expiring on the ears of an entranced but limited auditory, addressed mankind at large, flew through kingdoms, crossed seas, perpetuated and promulgated themselves to an incalculable extent. Individual men could not but be working out in their own studies, in their own chambers, in their own minds, the great problems of faith. The primal records of Christianity, in a narrow compass, passed into all the vernacular languages of the world, where they could not be followed by the vast, scattered, and ambiguous volumes of tradition. The clergy became less and less a separate body (the awakened conscience of men refused to be content with vicarious religion through them); they ceased to be the sole arbiters of man's destiny in another life: they sank back into society, to be distinguished only as the models and promoters of moral and religious virtue, and so of order, happiness, peace, and the hope of immortality. They derived their influence less from a traditional divine commission, or vested authority, than from their individual virtue, knowledge, and earnest, if less authoritative, inculcation of divine truth. Monasticism was rejected as alien to the primal religion of the Gospel; the family life, the life of the Christian family, resumed its place as the highest state of Christian grace and perfection.

'This progressive development of Christianity seems the inevitable consequence of man's progress in knowledge, and in the more general dissemination of that knowledge. Human thought is almost compelled to assert, and cannot help asserting, its original freedom. And as that progress is manifestly a law of human nature, proceeding from the divine Author of our being, this self-adaptation of the one true religion to that progress must have the divine sanction, and may be supposed, without presumption, to have been contemplated in the counsels of Infinite Wisdom.'—Vol. i. pp. 2—10.

The following note shows how far the author would allow the name of Christianity to extend:—

'It is obvious that I use Christianity, and indeed Teutonic Christianity, in its most comprehensive significance, from national episcopal churches, like that of England, which aspires to maintain the doctrines and organization of the apostolic, or immediately post-apostolic ages, onward to that dubious and undefinable verge where Christianity melts into a high moral theism, a faith which would expand to purer spirituality with less distinct dogmatic system; or that which would hardly call itself more than a Christian philosophy, a religious Rationalism. I presume not, neither is it the office of the historian, to limit the blessings of our religion either in this world or the world to come; "there is One who will know his own." As an

historian I can disfranchise none who claim, even on the slightest grounds, the privileges and hopes of Christianity: repudiate none who do not place themselves without the pale of believers and worshippers of Christ, or of God through Christ.'—Vol. i. p. 9, *note*.

In other words, the Teutonic element eliminates the Christian. It is quite true that as is the spirit of each age and race, such is the spirit of the religion that prevails; whether it be in its conformity to the general tendencies of the time, or in its opposition to it. The relaxed effeminacy of the Byzantine Empire, had, as its opposing principle, the severity of Stylites. But it is plain that we may conceive the spirit of the age influencing its Christianity so much as to make it cease to be in any true sense Christianity at all. And, short of this, it may modify it so as to make it widely different from true Christianity. This 'Christianity' of an age or country is the 'Christianity' of the many, though influencing in some degree, probably, all that are within its sphere.

Yet we must observe that the features of this 'Christianity' are, generally speaking, exaggerations of points that are really portions of the Christian system: and that the very existence of the exaggeration implies the preexistence of that of which it is an exaggeration; *e.g.* The sacerdotal principle may be exaggerated in Latin Christianity, yet the principle itself be an original part of the Christian scheme. Former ages ran into excesses and absurdities in asceticism; but the ascetic principle itself is an element of the religion as taught and practised by our Lord and His Apostles.

There is something which constitutes Christianity absolutely. There are facts and doctrines which form its essence; facts which occurred and are recorded as the basis of its visible and historical manifestation—doctrines which were taught by those who founded it as constituting that faith which made persons to be Christians—which made them truly such, in opposition alike (to take the earliest period) to those who rejected the name, and therein the facts, and to those who, while they assumed the name, rejected the faith, or explained or mysticised away the facts: and these were numerous, almost within the lifetime of the first preachers of the religion, and were regarded by them as Christians, 'falsely so called.' This body of facts and doctrines, which has a being and reality, independently of its being received and believed—independently of the particular minds in which it exists subjectively—when so received is modified in some degree by the spirit of him who receives it, still more by the spirit of the classes, or ages, or nations, in which it exists. But it is never to be forgotten that it has its own independent truth, and that it is in virtue of this, its absolute character, that it

continually manifests its own distinctness, and vindicates its authority, as something separate from, and above the opinions and tastes, and views of men. How many a case is there in which the Christianity of the individual (for we shall find in the man the epitome of the Church) is so modified by his own habitual view of its doctrines and rules, that it becomes an easy sort of religion, losing all its own bright characteristics, till some wrench of mind—some sudden overwhelming affliction—the perception of the truth put in some striking way—dispels his dreams, and Christianity as it really is stands before him in its evidence and reality, and claims and receives submission. So it is with the ages of the world. Analyse each age indeed—pass from the rough and general view of the world of any time, to the numberless portions of which it consists, and which have each their own ‘Christianity,’ the Christianity, say—for we do not use Dean Milman unfairly in so illustrating the principle on which he applies the term Teutonic Christianity to ‘a high moral Theism’—the Christianity of those classes of people who live by dishonest arts, of the London poor, of men deeply immersed in commerce, of ‘men about town,’ of men of science and literature, of ecclesiastics, of women; each of these on a small scale is a ‘Christianity.’ So you have Wesleyan Christianity, Quaker Christianity, Presbyterian, Anglican, Roman Christianity; each has a tone, a savour of its own. Pass from these to the Christianity of a country. You find that each has its characteristics. English Christianity (if we can imagine it abstracted from our numerous forms) would have marks that distinguish it from German or French Christianity. French and Spanish Christianity would be contrasted. So, in earlier ages, we may distinguish a special tone and mode of viewing Christian truth in the African, Alexandrian, Syrian Churches; and in each class or school within the scope of the Christian name. So again each age, say of Latin Christianity, has its own characteristics—the earlier times of Augustine and Ambrose, the Middle Age, the modern. It is the delight of one whose theory or whose work leads him that way to dwell on these points of contrast, to depict each strongly in its own characteristics, until they come to appear as so many different religions.

Yet Christian truth—in its independent, absolute form, as it exists free from the conceptions of men—meaning by Christian truth the facts, the doctrines, the morality, all that was done and taught by the original Founder of our religion—has a life and power which it has continually shown, in that it is itself the life of all that is Christian in these varying forms, and is continually counteracting those tendencies in them which are different from itself, and from time to time rising up, as

it were, and casting them out. What are those revivals of religion which, from age to age, have, with might irresistible, reversed the whole mass of popular religionism, immediately influencing the few, and ultimately making the tone of the Christianity that prevails in a country different from what it was? What truths of faith and practice there are which had been overlooked, or viewed amiss, by the spirit of the age; which vindicate their own independent being and power, by revolutionising that which seemed to have occupied their place! Our own days and our own Church have witnessed the beginning of such a change; who knows what may be its end?

The tendency of such a view as Dr. Milman's is to lead us to lose sight of an absolute Christianity; and the process by which this is to be counteracted is, by observing the substantial identity of Church Christianity at least, in all ages and all branches of the Church. As on the one hand, the unity of the Christian faith has been preserved, amongst other human instrumentalities, by the influence of different portions of the Church mutually checking each other—each of which, left alone, might have aberrated beyond the limits of truth; but which, acting on each other, as members of one Catholic Church, have steadied the whole—so is the unity of faith which is found in Christians of different ages, races, circumstances, the simplest evidence of the oneness of the religion—the proof that there is a truth of the Gospel independent of opinion, to which all these bear their testimony. Just as we argue the reality of moral truth, by finding a oneness in it underlying all the varied colouring of individual or class peculiarities, so—besides that distinct and most certain evidence which we derive from the written records of the first founders of our religion, and the historical testimony to the truths which they taught—we argue it from this unity underlying the variations. And this is to be judged of, not by extracts selected to maintain a theory—designed to exhibit the points of contrast between one age and another, or one writer and another—but by that which forms the body and substance of their writings—the very texture, as it were, of which they are composed. Let any one read the sermons of Chrysostom, or Gregory, or Bernard; he will find in them not only full as much identity of tone as, but a greater identity than, he will find in the productions of different schools of divines in the Church of England.

We have touched on these points, because there is a great danger of overrating the influence of local or temporary influences in modifying the faith. The subject is, however, far too extensive, and goes too deep, to be at all adequately treated here.

It is, however, the favourite view of the writer of this History,

that the doctrines held in each period are a modification of opinions belonging to, and influenced by, those various causes peculiar to the time, such as race, intelligence, general culture, national character, which modify other opinions. The effect, on the whole, is a greater impartiality in the representation of the views and temper that prevailed in past ages than we usually meet with. He is neither a panegyrist of the Ages of Faith, nor yet interested in exhibiting the marks of Antichrist. He looks on calmly at the phenomena which discover themselves, and portrays them fairly. He has no temptation to do otherwise. They are to him phases of human sentiment appropriate to that age, which an historian would endeavour to depict as faithfully as the literature or the dress of the same period. Those who regard the doctrinal decisions of the Church as of present authority, or are interested from controversial causes in thinking the Christians of those days better or worse than they were, are under a temptation to bend the facts to suit their own theory. But the author of this work has no such temptation: he looks calmly on; he regards contests about doctrines as quarrels about words or unimportant niceties; he delights to represent the opinions generally received as characteristic pictures of the life of those times. Read, for instance, the following passage, in which the history of the disputes on the Eucharist is introduced:—

‘ This Sacrament—the Eucharist—from the earliest times had withdrawn into the most profound mystery; it had been guarded with the most solemn reverence, shrouded in the most impressive ceremonial. It had become as it were the Holy of Holies of the religion, in which the presence of the Godhead was only the more solemn from the surrounding darkness. That Presence had as yet been unapproached by profane and searching controversy, had been undefined by canon, neither agitated before Council, nor determined by Pope. During all these centuries no language had been thought too strong to express the overpowering awe and reverence of the worshippers. The oratory of the pulpit and the hortatory treatise had indulged freely in the boldest images; the innate poetry of the faith had worked those images into realities. Christ’s real Presence was in some indescribable manner in the Eucharist; but under the notion of the real Presence might meet conceptions the most dissimilar, ranging from the most subtle spiritualism to the most gross materialism; that of those whose faith would be as profoundly moved by the commemorative symbols, which brought back upon the memory in the most vivid reality the one sacrifice upon the cross; as that of the vulgar, to whom the more material the more impressive the notion, to whom the sacred elements would be what the fetiche is to the savage.

‘ Between these two extremes would be the great multitude of believers, who would contemplate the whole subject with remote and reverential awe. To these the attempt at the scrutiny, or even the comprehension of the mystery, would appear the height of profane presumption; yet their intuitive apprehension would shrink on the one hand from refining the holy bread and wine into mere symbols, on the other from that transubstantia-

tion which could not but expose the actual Godhead to all the accidents to which those elements, not now merely corporeal, and with all the qualities of the human flesh and blood, but actually deified, might be subject. It was the fatal term Transubstantiation, first used by Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corvey, which startled some of the more reflective minds; according to this term the elements ceased entirely to be what they still seemed to be to the outward senses. The substance of the bread and wine was actually annihilated—nothing existed but the body and blood of the Redeemer, the body and blood of the Redeemer resuscitated in the flesh, yet to which belonged the ubiquity, the eternity of the divine nature.'—Vol. iii. pp. 20—22.

In the same way he regards monks and self-denying missionaries as a part of the age; and whilst he has no mercy on Eastern Monachism, and, in treating of it, loses the gift of sympathy, and the power, as it seems, of entering into the spirit which really prompted men to lives of self-denial—real, indeed, however exaggerated—he finds in Western Monachism a power and energy—a real influence exercised over the world and a turn given to its affairs—a nobleness and heroism in the characters of individual members of the class, which awakens his admiration, and calls forth some of his most eloquent descriptions.

Still Dr. Milman dislikes these ascetics. That is very plain. And he dislikes those who did not think that Christian truths were modes of sentiment, or the distinctions of truth and error minute verbal differences. Men who sacrificed quiet, home, the regard of friends, the satisfactions of life, nay, life itself, to maintain or propagate a doctrine, cannot be understood by one who thinks doctrines phases of opinion. They seem mere hinderers of the natural progress of things, or violent anticipators of it.

And yet whatever theorists may say of the natural progress of opinion or of social changes—for the two cases are parallel—supposing that, upon their own showing, states go through a series of changes, and that the general progress or decline of thought and reason produces a corresponding change in the religious opinions entertained—very little consideration shows us that it still depends, humanly speaking, on individual energy, whether the current is made to flow in one direction or another, and that doctrines influence the temper of a people just as much as their temper influences the doctrine. Will any one maintain that it was unimportant to the Church's temper whether the Catholic or the Arian doctrine was established in the fourth century? Or that there was any such sympathy of national character with one set of opinions rather than the other, as that France might not have had the Huguenot as the established religion instead of the Catholic? and would France in that case have been what France is now? or Ireland, had it been Protestant; or Scotland, had it been Catholic? Individual men are the instruments by which great changes are

carried out, or great truths maintained, whether in politics or religion. They give a direction to the current, and it flows on steadily in the course on which they have started it; whether it be that they are the foremost in effecting those changes which the times require, or in withstanding the evil spirit which rules their age. For the great man has to oppose his age, though in after times he seems to lead it. Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm, Bernard—all had lives of contention. We say this, because the practical inference from the notion of the doctrines belonging to the age is, that you may sit at home, leave such matters alone, and they will shape themselves aright; and that the spirit of the age, whatever that may be, must prevail; and that those who have, in past or present times, taken the course of energetically maintaining the truth, are 'troublers of Israel.'

Our theorists cannot enter into the minds of such men, or appreciate them. If there are manifest faults of character in any one, his earnestness for religious doctrine is at once condemned as a mere excuse for personal quarrels or party aggrandisement; and, as in S. Cyril of Alexandria, no language of reproach appears too stern. If the character be otherwise good, this feature, with all allied to it, is regarded as a flaw—the child and parent of evil. Bernard's sanctity is suspected when he opposes Abelard; and candour—the disposition not to judge unfavourably without manifest cause—is suspended in his case.

The same persons, when treating of religious wars as a phase of a certain age, and so more favourably than ordinary historians, yet seem not to perceive that it is war itself which is evil; and that war for revenge, or ambition, or liberty, or to gain or protect commercial advantages—however it may be necessary from the present condition of mankind—is quite as unjustifiable as war undertaken for the protection of religious privileges or securing the profession of Christianity. The example of the primitive Christians, in not taking up arms for their own defence or security, should be followed consistently. The impartiality, or *adiaphory*, of the Dean, makes him, in these respects, hard on those who, as he thinks, lay too great a stress on differences.

So again, we conceive, he fails entirely in doing justice to the characters of those great men who stood forward—few in number, but devoted in zeal, and deeply rooted in conviction—to deliver the Church in the twelfth century from the secularity and utter corruption into which it had fallen—to introduce a moral reformation, and to secure that reformation according to the best of their judgment, by giving the Church the power of self-government.

Can any one who has contemplated the deep abyss of degra-

dation into which the papacy had fallen in the tenth and eleventh centuries—when the salt had lost its savour, as it might seem, irrecoverably,—when, according to the language of the time, it was felt and deplored that Christ was asleep in the ship—and when the Church was just being sunk into and identified with the world, a world of vice, violence, and iniquity—not admire the band of resolute reformers who raised it from its low estate, and presented it, conspicuous in the piety and earnestness of its saints, and the devotion which pervaded the whole Christian body? Is there not a great work here, at which we might well turn aside, and see what has been done?

We select this instance, because it is a very marked one in the history of Latin Christianity. It is, perhaps, *the* very turning-point of its existence, and it is one which it seems to us the author of these volumes has very inadequately depicted.

It will, however, be more in place to speak on this point after we have given some sketch of the History itself.

Before doing that, we may refer to some minor arrangements, which assist materially in reading the History.

The tables of contents of each volume supply the dates of the events. These become a kind of chronological analysis of the work. Then, at the commencement of each of the historical periods into which the work is divided, there is a table of contemporary chronology, where we have the lists and dates of the popes, the contemporary patriarchs, emperors, and kings. These tables compensate, in some measure, for the want of fulness in the details of the narrative. The margin, again, supplies the dates. In some respects, there has been negligence in the printing. In vol. ii. p. 250, and those which follow, we have in each page the dates 778, 778, 769, 779, 779. These ought to have been respectively 768, 769, throughout.

There is also an inaccuracy often repeated, and of much more grave importance: the misplacing of the little letters that are intended to show the references to the notes. When a reader sees one of these, and looks down to the note, he naturally supposes that the reference there given is the authority for the statement in the text to which the letter is attached; but this is very often wrongly placed, and the reader is accordingly misled to suppose that an authority is given for a statement when it is not.

We have seen numerous instances of this. We shall specify one, because we wish to notice the passage on other grounds.

The election of Pope Damasus was disputed. As far as we can see, he was elected, but had not been consecrated, when a small minority of the clergy met and elected Ursinus or Ursicinus, and contrived to have him consecrated. Damasus and his party proceeded by violence to eject them from a church

which they were occupying. The tumult led to bloodshed, and very many of the party of Ursinus were killed. Ammianus Marcellinus states this generally. It is recorded by Jerome, Rufinus, Socrates. But there is also an account of it in a memorial addressed to the Emperors some time after; to which is prefixed a preface, giving an account of the affair which is most unfavourable to Damasus; accusing him of various misdemeanours, and of having himself taken the most prominent part in the affray; and this with a vehemence of expression, which gives the whole the character of a violent personal attack. This Sirmond discovered in MS. and printed. Its whole tone is such that one would not be disposed to give it any weight, even if there were no other account of the proceedings, nor other reason to suspect it of unfaithfulness. There is such reason, however, in the high esteem in which Damasus was held; in the fact that he belonged to the strict religious party of the time; that he was the friend of Jerome; that it was he who urged and encouraged the new translation of the Scriptures; that he was something of a sacred poet; that Jerome deferred to him on points of authority, while he asked Jerome for explanations of Holy Scripture; that he was regarded as the pattern of orthodoxy, and that agreement with the faith of Damasus was the standard of right belief laid down by Theodosius. Especially he encouraged religious retirement, and abundant charities and holy life, among the Christians of Rome. That such a person should be the object of attack, that his character should be calumniated, and malignant reports circulated about him, would not be strange, even if there were no party reasons for it; and we should have thought that an historian, writing of that period, who had thought fit to mention these reports (which, of course, it may be necessary to do in order to give us a true view of the state of the Roman Church, of the evil as well as the good that was in it), ought to have put forward the slight grounds on which they are based, and their improbability, so clearly as not to leave any other impression on the reader's mind. We think Dean Milman has not done this. He has stated the calumnies against Damasus and also those against Jerome, without mentioning that Jerome distinctly denied the charges; as who that at all appreciates his character could doubt that they were calumnies?

We will give the description from the History of Latin Christianity:—

‘On the death of Liberius, the factions, which had smouldered in secret, broke out again with fatal fury. The Pontificate of Damasus displays Christianity now not merely the dominant, it might almost seem the sole religion of Rome; and the Roman character is working as visibly into Christianity. The election to the Christian bishopric arrays the people in adverse factions; the government is appalled; churches become citadels,

are obstinately defended, furiously stormed; they are defiled with blood. Men fall in murderous warfare before the altar of the Prince of Peace. In one sense it might seem the reanimation of Rome to new life, ancient Rome is resuming her wonted but long-lost liberties. The iron hand of despotism, from the time of the last Triumvirate, or rather from the accession of Augustus to the Empire, had compressed the unruly populace, which only occasionally dared to break out, on a change in the Imperial dynasty, to oppose, or be the victims of, the Prætorian soldiery. Now, however, the Roman populace appears quickened by a new principle of freedom; of freedom, if with some of its bold independence, with all its blind partisanship, its headstrong and stubborn ferocity. The great offices, which still perpetuated in name the ancient Republic, the Senatorship, Quæstorship, Consulate, are quietly transmitted according to the Imperial mandates, excite no popular commotion, nor even interest; for they are honorary titles, which confer neither influence, authority, nor wealth. Even the Prefecture of the city is accepted at the will of the Emperor, who rarely condescends to visit Rome. But the election to the bishopric is now not merely an affair of importance—the affair of paramount importance it might seem,—in Rome; it is an event in the annals of the world. The heathen historian, on whose notice had already been forced the Athanasian controversy, Athanasius himself, the acts and the exile of Liberius, assigns the same place to the contested promotion of Damasus which Livy might to that of one of the great consuls, tribunes, or dictators. He interprets, as well as relates, the event:—"No wonder that for so magnificent a prize as the Bishopric of Rome, men should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city; to ride, splendidly attired, in a stately chariot; to sit at a profuse, luxuriant, more than imperial, table—these are the rewards of successful ambition." The honest historian contrasts this pomp and luxury with the abstemiousness, the humility, the exemplary gentleness of the provincial prelates. Ammianus, ignorant or regardless as to the legitimacy of either election, arraigns both Damasus and his rival Ursicinus as equally guilty authors of the tumult. Of the Christian writers (and there are, singularly enough, contemporary witnesses, probably eye-witnesses, on each side), the one asserts the priority and legality of election in favour of Damasus, the other of Ursicinus; the one aggravates, the other extenuates the violence and slaughter. But that scenes occurred of frightful atrocity is beyond all doubt. So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the Præfect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighbourhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the basilica of Sisinnius. The triumph of Damasus cannot relieve his memory from the sanction, the excitement, hardly from active participation in these deeds of blood. Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus: he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled. Another frightful massacre took place in the church of St. Agnes. The Emperor was forced to have recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Prætextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possession of his see.

'The strife between Damasus and Ursicinus was a prolongation or revival of that between Liberius and Felix, and so may have remotely grown out of the doctrinal conflict of Arianism and Trinitarianism.'—Vol. i. pp. 67—70.

We need cite no more; we will only observe here that Dr. Milman seems to be right in supposing that there was a contest between Arianism and Catholicity; but as he says before, at p. 65, that 'Bishop Felix, if not himself an Arian, did not scruple to communicate with Arians,' we might be led to think, as the Preface to the 'libel' asserts, that the party of Felix had elected Damasus; whereas it is certain, from a passage in a letter of S. Jerome to Damasus, which the author has overlooked, that Ursinus was the Arian, Damasus the Catholic Bishop. His words are:—'*Et si ita est, cur ab Ario parietibus separamur; perfidia copulati? Jungatur cum Beatitudine tuâ Ursinus; cum Ambrosio Auxentius.*' (Epist. xv. vol. i. p. 39. Ed. Vallars.) As Auxentius was the Arian anti-Bishop of Milan, so it would seem that Ursinus was the Arian anti-Pope of Rome. But, as the Dean says, in a note, p. 68, 'According to the Preface (is it quite certain that the Preface is of the same date?) to this 'Libellus Precum, Damasus is supported by the party of Felix; he was the successor of Felix, the reputed Arian, Ursicinus of 'Liberius.' We think that the Preface is not of the same date as the Libellus—that it is written by a violent partisan, opposed to Damasus, and also opposed to the Arians; possibly by one of the Luciferians—that party in the Church who refused to join in the healing measures of Athanasius, or to communicate with those who received with returning Arianizers. Anyhow, it bears the marks of being a calumnious production.

But the passage we are more concerned with occurs a little later. The Dean has been speaking of monasticism in Rome. Now, when asceticism is the supposed fruit of the spirit of the age—when it is the seemingly natural development of the religious temper—it is viewed by him with condescending acquiescence. But here we have asceticism springing up in the midst of that most luxurious, wealthy, pleasure-loving city, Rome; springing up under the sanction and encouragement of a few, a very few, great and earnest-minded men—of the very practical Athanasius, a man in whom good sense is as conspicuous as sanctity; of Jerome, one of the most learned and able men of the time; of Damasus, the Bishop of the city, himself a man of refined taste, and one that, as we have seen, thought it right to adopt great external splendour and style. The Dean considers this asceticism a development of the Roman character; it is Christian Stoicism. We would only observe that asceticism was so universal that it would be much more reasonable to attribute it to some common principle in human nature and in Christianity.

'But the Roman character did not interwork into the general Christianity alone, it embraced monastic Christianity, in all its extremest rigour,

its sternest asceticism, with the same ardour and energy. Christian Stoicism could not but find its Catos; but it was principally among the females that the recoil seemed to take place from the utter shamelessness, the unspeakable profligacy of the Imperial times to a severity of chastity, to a fanatic appreciation of virginity, as an angelic state, as a kind of religious aristocratical distinction, far above the regular virtues of the wife or the matron. Pope Damasus, though by no means indifferent to the splendour of his office, was the patron, as his secretary Jerome was the preacher of this powerful party; and between this party and the priesthood of Rome there was already that hostility which has so constantly prevailed between the Regulars, the observants of monastic rule, and what were called in later times the secular clergy. The monastics inveighed against the worldly riches, pomp, and luxury of the clergy: the clergy looked with undisguised jealousy on the growing, irresistible influence of the monks, especially over the high-born females. Jerome hated, and was hated with the most cordial reciprocity. The austere Jerome was accused, unjustly no doubt, of more than spiritual intimacy with his distinguished converts; his enemies brought a charge of adultery against Pope Damasus himself.'—Vol. i. pp. 71, 72.

On these last words there is the following note, the note-mark being attached to the word 'himself.'

'Quem in tantum matronæ diligebant, ut matronarum auriscalpius diceretur.—So says the preface to the hostile petition, the *Libellus Precum*. Apud Sirmord. i. p. 136.'—Vol. i. p. 72.

Of course one would suppose that this charge was expressed in the words cited in the note, and was consequently a charge of habitual adultery, and was contained in the preface to the Hostile Petition. This is not an unimportant point. The writer of that preface evidently endeavoured to allege all he could against the character of Damasus. But he does not bring this charge. He does not insinuate it. He only accuses the Bishop—as any foul-mouthed slanderer now might accuse a holy man, who was the adviser and director of religious women—of ministering to the relief of their 'itching ears;' or, as we might say, tickling their ears. The word 'auriscalpius' has no impure sense. Anastasius, writing two centuries later, says that Damasus was accused of adultery, and cleared by a council of forty-four bishops. Just so S. Athanasius was accused of murder, and produced the man alleged to have been murdered, as a living testimony to the falsity of the charge. But coming to us only on the authority of Anastasius, the whole statement is very doubtful; and we think the author should have taken care not to allow any impression of the truth of these insinuations to remain.

To return; great assistance in mastering the History may be derived from the portions into which the author has divided it; each book corresponding to one of the divisions; and the divisions themselves being based on the marked points in the progress

and development of the Latin Church, and the power of its Bishops. The three volumes already published bring that power up to the verge of its greatest external height, at the close of the twelfth century. But through what a series of wonderful changes did it arrive at that point!

If there is one thing which strikes us more than any other in the History of Latin Christianity, it is the vitality of that system whose progress it depicts; a vitality from which it not only withstands persecution, from heathen or heretical emperors,—continues as a barrier against invading tribes, living on while they, heretical and infidel, as well as barbarian, sweep over and almost sweep away the Churches, first of one part, then another, of Christendom—is tossed about by powerful emperors whose interests clash with those of the Church, or who would reform the Church, and masters and survives them—but what is more wonderful, springs up again after years of indifference and weakness, retains its hold on the world notwithstanding its gross corruptions, and when it might seem that the papacy itself had sunk into a depth of degradation from which it could not recover, yet under Pontiffs of a different character is again and again restored. Imperial Rome gained its hold on the world by slow and gradual advances. It had its reverses, and in early days there were times when it was on the verge of extinction; when Porsena all but, or altogether, overcame it—or when the Capitol, alone left, was saved as by a divine intervention. Old Rome, too, had its internal contentions, and it might at last seem strange that it held so long together. But these are nothing to what Christian Rome exhibits. Earthly power goes on increasing, and once destroyed, it cannot be restored; but a power which rests on influence over the minds of men, a religious influence, survives under the seeming loss of all external power. It is strengthened under oppression. It flourishes amid calamities. It shoots forth again as soon as it is cut down; and, as in a night, recovers and extends its former empire. And there was this influence in the truths which Christianity taught, and of which Rome was the centre, even when, as existing in Rome itself, they were overlaid with corruptions.

I. Four centuries from the birth of Christ—little more than three and a half from its own origination—bring the Roman Church to a position of independence, of manifested dignity, of influence over the world as well as over the Christian body. It is interesting to see how it emerges from time to time from the obscurity in which its earlier history is involved: how, ever and anon, as you go over the list of its Bishops and the years of their supposed episcopates, you come across points where the

obscurity is in a measure removed, and some individual stands out conspicuously, or some view is given of the condition of the Church itself. Myths and forgeries being removed, you see S. Clement, in his calm and brotherly office, exhorting the Corinthian Christians, Anicetus and Polycarp, Victor, and Zephyrinus and Callistus—later still, Cornelius and Dionysius. Then, when the empire became Christian, an association, which is mentioned in the first century only as an obscure, despised sect, comes to be recognised as an empire within an empire; meets emperors face to face, and receives homage, as a spiritual guide and ruler, from them.

The first division of the History begins at the earliest period of the existence of Christianity in Rome, when it was almost unknown in the world. Dr. Milman brings out fully the view which has the remarkably concurrent support of the Chevalier Bunsen and Cardinal Wiseman, that the Christians in Rome for more than two centuries were a Greek-speaking people. The view has been maintained with great ability, but we are disposed to think that it is somewhat exaggerated. The strongest argument for it, no doubt, is that which Dr. Wiseman has worked out, namely, that the first Latin versions of the Scriptures were made in Africa, as if they were not needed in Rome. This might seem, to a person of this day, a strong argument, but we doubt its being so. We doubt, that is, whether it implies that the great body of the Christians spoke Greek as their proper language. It is clear, from what Irenæus says of the many nations of barbarians who were Christians, and had not the Holy Scriptures in their language, that the need for translating them was not felt so strongly then as we might suppose. The mass of Christians did not read the Scriptures. The educated classes in Rome were able to read the Greek; whereas, in Africa, the same class could not do it. Greek was the literary language in Rome; from this cause, as well as the universal circulation of works written in that language, the Christian literature was Greek. The language of the religious services bears trace of a Greek original; but that Greek was the language in which it was ordinarily celebrated in the Roman churches of the second century is, we think, highly questionable.

From this obscurity the Roman Church gradually emerged, as its numbers increased and commanded the attention, the deference, the persecutions, or the submission, of the world and the rulers of the world—till, in the middle of the fourth century, after Silvester, Julius, and Liberius, Pope Damasus stands out to be praised and maligned, and the bloody contention of the Christians in the election of a bishop, and the splendour in which that bishop lives, are subjects for the historian

of the world to notice; as, indeed, the world was coming to cast in its lot with the rising religion, and, by submitting, to try to share its power. Paganism was being put down. And as the world was coming into, and lowering the discipline and the common standard of Christian practice, there was rising up, as a counterbalancing influence, as an attempt to realize that apostolic model of religion, which the Holy Scriptures set forth—that severance from the world and union in religious strictness and retirement which we call Monachism. Christianity has mastered Paganism, and develops within itself a strict and holy rule, so that there is a world and a select religious body within itself. Coincidentally with the Emperors becoming Christians, the seats of empire were removed to Constantinople and to Milan. Rome was left to the undivided influence, and gradually to the undivided rule, of the Bishop of the Church that ‘so-journed there.’

II. The next half century, or little more, witnesses a revolution. The old empire, with its centuries of accumulated power, has fallen; whilst hordes of savage tribes overthrow and tread upon it. They build not up an empire for themselves, but prepare the way for the development of a principle of life and power which exists within the ancient and outgrown body; they break down that power which hinders it from manifesting itself. As the embryo out of the decaying seed, as the young out of the broken egg, so did the power of the Latin Church spring from the destruction of the Western Empire,—its life was manifested in the moral death and corruption of the Roman people. The contrast of Rome and Constantinople, throughout their history, shows that the destruction of the imperial power was the great means of developing the spiritual. And the bishops of Rome, as it were in the way of an anticipatory omen, showed their power on the first coming of the barbarians against the city. They overawed, and swayed, and turned back the conquerors. They saved Rome. They became the chief persons in Rome itself. They claimed authority in, if not over, the whole Church.

These sixty years include the period of the great controversies respecting the Incarnation, which shook the Eastern Church, and tended greatly to elevate the influence and authority of the see of Rome. The tone in which these subjects are treated here may be called impartial. We consider that it labours under one great fault. It does not enter into the views, and so cannot rightly appreciate the conduct, of those who believed that truth ought to be contended for—the truth on a point which is essential to the Christian faith. S. Cyril is treated with uniform unmitigated severity, and, as it were, with detestation.

On the other hand, S. Leo is evidently a character on whom the author delights to dwell. In him he sees no fault. There is a nobleness and greatness in his character which captivates the imagination of the poet, and draws out all his sympathies. He is one born to command, and to bow the will of others to his own. Dean Milman's character of him will be read with interest:—

'The Pontificate of Leo the Great is one of the epochs in the history of Latin, or rather of universal Christianity. Christendom, wherever mindful of its divine origin, and of its proper humanising and hallowing influence, might turn away in shame from these melancholy and disgraceful contests in the East. On the throne of Rome alone, of all the greater sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety; and, if it demanded undue deference, the world would not be inclined rigidly to question pretensions supported as well by such conscious power as by such singular and unimpeachable virtue; and by such inestimable benefits conferred on Rome, on the Empire, on civilization. Once Leo was supposed to have saved Rome from the most terrible of barbarian conquerors; a second time he mitigated the horrors of her fall, before the King of the Vandals. During his pontificate, Leo is the only great name in the Empire; it might almost seem in the Christian world. The Imperial Sovereignty might be said to have expired with Theodosius the Great. Women ruled in Ravenna and in Constantinople, and their more masculine abilities, even their virtues, reflected a deeper shame on the names of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., the boy sovereigns of the East and West. Even after the death of Theodosius, Marcian reigned in the East, as the husband of Pulcheria. In the West the suspected fidelity impaired the power, as it lowered the character, of Aëtius; his inhuman murder deprived the empire of its last support; and the Count Boniface, the friend of Augustine, in his fatal revenge, opened Africa to the desolating Vandal. Leo stood equally alone and superior in the Christian world. Two years before the accession of Leo, Augustine had died. He had not lived to witness the capture and ruin of Hippo, his episcopal city. The fifth year after the accession of Leo, died Cyril of Alexandria; Nestorius survived, but in exile, his relentless rival. He was succeeded by Dioscorus, who seemed to have inherited all which was odious in Cyril, with far inferior polemic ability; afterwards an Eutychian heretic, and hardly to be acquitted of the murder of his rival, Flavianus. This future victim of the enmity of Dioscorus filled the see of Constantinople. Domnus, a name of no great distinction, was Patriarch of Antioch. In the West there are few, either ecclesiastics or others, who even aspire to a doubtful fame; such as Prosper, the poet of the Pelagian controversy, and Cassianus, the legislator of the Western monasteries.

'Leo, like most of his great predecessors and successors, was a Roman. He was early devoted to the service of the Church; and so high was the opinion of his abilities, that even as an acolyte he was sent to Africa with letters condemnatory of Pelagianism. By the great African prelates Aurelius and St. Augustine he was confirmed in his strong aversion to those doctrines, which might seem irreconcilable with his ardent piety. He urged upon Pope Sixtus the persecution of the unfortunate Julianus. When Leo was yet only a deacon, Cassianus dedicated to him his work on the Incarnation. At the decease of Pope Sixtus, Leo was absent on a civil mission, the importance of which shows the lofty estimate of his powers. It was no less than an attempt to reconcile the two rival generals, Aëtius and Albinus, whose fatal quarrel hazarded the dominion of Rome in Gaul.

There was no delay; all Rome, clergy, senate, people, by acclamation, raised the absent Leo to the vacant see. Leo disdained the customary hypocrisy of compelling the electors to force the dignity upon him. With the self-confidence of a commanding mind he assumed the office, in the pious assurance that God would give him strength to fulfil the arduous duties so imposed. Leo was a Roman in sentiment as in birth. All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone. The union of the Churchman and the Roman is singularly displayed in his sermon on the day of St. Peter and St. Paul; their conjoint authority was that double title to obedience on which he built his claim to power, but chiefly as successor of St. Peter, for whom and for his ecclesiastical heirs he asserted a proto-Apostolic dignity. From Peter and through Peter all the other Apostles derived their power. No less did he assert the predestined perpetuity of Rome, who had only obtained her temporal autocracy to prepare the way, and as a guarantee, for her greater spiritual supremacy. St. Peter and St. Paul were the Romulus and Remus of Christian Rome. Pagan Rome had been the head of the heathen world; the empire of her divine religion was to transcend that of her worldly dominion. Her victories had subdued the earth and the sea, but she was to rule still more widely than she had by her wars, through the peaceful triumphs of her faith. It was because Rome was the capital of the world that the chief of the Apostles was chosen to be her teacher, in order that from the head of the world the light of truth might be revealed over all the earth.

'The haughtiness of the Roman might seem to predominate over the meekness of the Christian. Leo is indignant that slaves were promoted to the dignity of the sacerdotal office; not merely did he require the consent of the master, lest the Church should become a refuge for contumacious slaves, and the established rights of property be invaded, but the baseness of the slave brought discredit on the majesty of the priestly office.

'Though Leo's magnificent vision of the universal dominion of Rome and of Christianity blended the indomitable ambition of the ancient Roman with the faith of the Christian, the world might seem rather darkening towards the ruin of both. Leo may be imagined as taking a calm and comprehensive survey of the arduous work in which he was engaged, the state of the various provinces over which he actually exercised, or aspired to, supremacy. In Rome heathenism appears, as a religion, extinct; but heretics, especially the most odious of all, the Manicheans, were in great numbers. In Rome, Leo ruled not merely with Apostolic authority, but took upon himself the whole Apostolic function. He was the first of the Roman Pontiffs whose popular sermons have come down to posterity. The Bishops of Constantinople seem to have been the great preachers of their city. Pulpit oratory was their recommendation to the see, and the great instrument of their power. Chrysostom was not the first, though the greatest, who had been summoned to that high dignity, for the fame of his eloquence. From the pulpit Nestorius had waged war against his adversaries. Leo, no doubt, felt his strength; he could cope with the minds of the people, and make the pulpit what the rostrum had been of old. His sermons singularly contrast with the florid, desultory, and often imaginative and impassioned style of the Greek preachers. They are brief, simple, severe; without fancy, without metaphysic subtlety, without passion: it is the Roman Censor animadverting with nervous majesty on the vices of the people; the Roman Prætor dictating the law,

and delivering with authority the doctrine of the faith. They are singularly Christian—Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ, his birth, his passion, his resurrection; only polemic so far as called upon by the prevailing controversies to assert with especial emphasis the perfect deity and the perfect manhood of Christ. Either the practical mind of Leo disdained, or in Rome the age had not yet fully expanded the legendary and poetic religion, the worship of the Virgin and the Saints. St. Peter is not so much a sacred object of worship as the great ancestor from whom the Roman Pontiff has inherited supreme power. One martyr alone is commemorated, and that with nothing mythic or miraculous in the narrative—the Roman Laurentius, by whose death Rome is glorified, as Jerusalem by that of Stephen.—Vol. i. pp. 178—182.

Again, after describing the condition of the Eastern Church during this period of controversy, and its subjection to the imperial authority, he says:—

‘Leo seemed fully to comprehend the importance and the dignity of his position. He took the most zealous interest in the whole controversy, but his activity was grave, earnest, and serious. His language to the Eastern Emperors, and especially to the Princess Pulcheria, may sound too adulatory to modern ears. The divinity of the earthly sovereign was acknowledged in terms too nearly approaching that reserved for the great divine Sovereign. This, however, must be judged with some regard to the sentiments and expressions of the age; and his deference was in language rather than in thought. Leo addresses these earthly masters with an independence of opinion, more as their equal, almost more as their master, than would have been ventured by any other subject at that time in either empire.

‘In the West, meantime, Leo might seem, under the sole impulse of generous self-devotion, and reliance on the majesty of religion, to assume the noblest function of the civil power, the preservation of the Empire, of Italy, of Rome itself, of Christianity, from the most tremendous enemy which had ever threatened their freedom and peace. While the Emperor Valentinian III. took refuge in Rome, and rumours spread abroad of his meditated flight, abdication, abandonment of his throne, Leo almost alone stood fearless. An embassy, of which the Bishop of Rome was no doubt considered by the general reverence of his own age, as well as by posterity, as the head and chief, arrested the terrible Attila on the frontiers of Italy, and dispersed the host of savage and but half-human Huns. Leo, to grateful Rome, might appear as the peaceful Camillus, as the unarmed Marius, repelling invaders far more fearful than the Gauls or the Cimbrians.’ . . .

‘The last struggles of Roman pride, which had rejected the demand of Attila for the hand of the Princess Honoria (his self-offered bride, whose strange adventures illustrate the degradation of the Imperial family), and which had been delayed by the obstinate resistance of Aquileia to the whole army of Attila, were crushed by the fall and utter extermination of that city, and the total subjugation of Italy as far as the banks of the Po. Valentinian, the Emperor, fled from Ravenna to Rome. To some no doubt he might appear to seek succour at the feet of the Roman Pontiff; but the abandonment of Italy was rumoured to be his last desperate determination.

‘At this fearful crisis, the insatiable and victorious Hun seemed suddenly and unaccountably to pause in his career of triumph. He stood rebuked and subdued before a peaceful embassy, of which, with the greater part of the world, the Bishop of Rome, as he held the most conspicuous station, so he received almost all the honour. The names of the rich Consular Avienus, of the Prefect of Italy, Trigettius, who ventured with

Leo to confront the barbarian conqueror, were speedily forgotten; and Leo stands forth the sole preserver of Italy. On the shores of the Benacus the ambassadors encountered the fearful Attila. Overawed (as the belief was eagerly propagated, and as eagerly accepted) by the personal dignity, the venerable character, and by the religious majesty of Leo, Attila consented to receive the large dowry of the Princess Honoria, and to retire from Italy. The death of Attila in the following year, by the bursting of a blood-vessel, on the night during which he had wedded a new wife, may have been brooding, as it were, in his constitution, and somewhat subdued his fiercer energy of ambition. His army, in all probability, was weakened by its conquests, and by the uncongenial climate and unaccustomed luxuries of Italy. But religious awe may still have been the dominant feeling which enthralled the mind of Attila. The Hun, with the usual superstitiousness of the polytheist, may have trembled before the God of the stranger, whom nevertheless he did not worship. The best historian of the period relates that the fate of Alarie, who had survived so short a time the conquest of Rome, was known to Attila, and seemed to have made a profound impression upon him. The dauntless confidence and the venerable aspect of Leo would confirm this apprehension of encountering, as it were, in his sanctuary the God now adored by the Romans. Legend, indeed, has attributed the submission of Attila to a visible apparition of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, who menaced the trembling heathen with a speedy divine judgment if he repelled the proposals of their successor. But this materialising view, though it may have heightened the beauty of Raffaele's painting of Leo's meeting with Attila, by the introduction of preter-human forms, lowers the moral grandeur of the whole transaction. The simple faith in his God, which gave the Roman Pontiff courage to confront, and threw that commanding majesty over his words and actions which wrought upon the mind of the barbarian, is far more Christianly sublime than this unnecessarily-imagined miracle.'—Vol. i. pp. 213—216.

III. The next period carries us on from this great Pope to the time of his greater successor, Gregory I. Through a period of a century and a half, popes of very ordinary qualities occupied the see. Gelasius and Hormisdas are most prominent. During most of this time Italy was occupied by Arian Ostrogoths, till these were overcome by the great general of Justinian. The Monophysite controversies raged in the East; and the influence of the Church was weakened by it. But the monotony of the papal history is relieved by some most interesting episodes: the conversion of the Teutonic races—the legislation of Justinian—the monasticism of the West.

In treating the first of these subjects, the author draws out the national character, temper, and religion of the Teutonic races; and shows how these predisposed them for receiving Christianity in the form in which it was now presented to them, and qualified it when received. He says:—

'There might appear in the Teutonic religious character a depth, seriousness, and tendency to the mysterious, congenial to Christianity, which would prepare them to receive the Gospel. The Grecian polytheist was often driven into Christianity by the utter void in his religion, and by

the incongruity of its poetic anthropomorphism with the progress of his discursive reason, as well as by his weariness with his unsatisfactory and exhausted philosophy: the Roman was commended by its high moral tone and vigour of character. But each had to abandon temples, rites, diversions, literature, which had the strongest hold on his habits and character, and so utterly incongruous with the primitive Gospel, that until Christianity made some steps towards the old religion by the splendour of its ceremonial, and the incipient paganising, not of its creed, but of its popular belief, there were powerful countervailing tendencies to keep him back from the new faith. And when the Greek entered into the Church, he was not content without exercising the quickness of his intelligence, and the versatilities of his language on his creed, without analysing, discussing, defining everything; or by intruding that higher part of his philosophy, which best assimilated with Christianity, he either philosophised Christianity, or for a time, as under the Neo-Platonists and Julian, set up a partially Christianised philosophy as a new and rival religion. The inveterate corruption of Roman manners confined that vigorous Christian morality, its strongest commendation to the Roman mind, at first within the chosen few, who were not utterly abased by licentiousness or by servility: and even with them in large part it was obedience to civil authority, respect for established law, perhaps in many a kind of sympathy with the lofty and independent sacerdotal dignity, the sole representative of old Roman freedom, which contributed to Christianise the Latin world.

‘How much more suited were some parts of the Teutonic character to harmonise at first with Christianity, and to keep the proselytes in submission to the authority of its instructors in these sublime truths; at the same time to strengthen the Church by the infusion of its own strength and independence of thought and action, as well as to barbarise it with that ferocity which causes, is increased by, and maintains, the foreign conquest of ruder over more polished races! Already the German had the conception of an illimitable Deity, towards whom he looked with solemn and reverential awe. Tacitus might seem to speak the language of a Christian father, almost of a Jewish prophet. Their gods could not be confined within walls, and it was degradation to these vast unseen powers to represent them under the human form. Reverential awe alone could contemplate that mysterious being which they called divinity. These deities, or this one Supreme, were shrouded in the untrodden, impenetrable forest. Such seems to have been the sublime conception above, if not anterior to, what may be called the mythology of Teutonic religion.’—Vol. i. pp. 257, 258.

We have not space to follow up this part of the subject, which is very interesting.

The legislation of Justinian might at first sight appear not very much in place; but it is made so by tracing out the extent to which it was modified by Christianity. This it was in but a slight degree; legislation respecting religion was added to the previous body of law; Christianity was taken into the system. It was not, as in our own Anglo-Saxon law, the fountain from which it sprung. The old long-established system continued; Christianity had come in upon a settled civilization. Among the northern tribes, civilization grew out of Christianity.

The age of Gregory the Great was the age of Benedict, the great moulder of Western Monasticism.

'The extension and organization of monasticism in the West owes its principal strength and uniformity to Benedict of Nursia. The life of Benedict, from infancy to death, is the most perfect illustration of the motives which then worked upon the mind of man. In him meet together and combine all those influences which almost divided mankind into recluses or cœnobites, and those who pursued an active life; as well as all the effects, in his case the best effects, produced by this phasis of human thought and feeling. Benedict, it was said, was born at that time, like a sun to dispel the Cimmerian darkness which brooded over Christendom, and to revive the expiring spirit of monasticism. The whole world was desolated by the inroads of the northern conquerors; the thrones of the new western kingdoms were filled by barbarian heretics; the East was distracted with controversy. War had not respected the monastic institutions; and those were fortunate who were shrouded in the mountain glens of the Apennines, or lay hid in some remote and sea-girt island. His age acknowledged Benedict as the perfect type of the highest religion, and Benedict impersonated his age.

'In the time of Benedict no man could have made a profound impression or exercised an enduring influence upon the mind of man, without that enthusiasm in himself which would environ him with wonder, or without exciting that enthusiasm in others which would eagerly accept, propagate, and multiply the miracles which avouched his sanctity.

'How perfectly the whole atmosphere was impregnated with this inexhaustible yearning for the supernatural, appears from the ardour with which the monastic passions were indulged at the earliest age. Children were nursed and trained to expect at every instant more than human interferences; their young energies had ever before them examples of asceticism, to which it was the glory, the true felicity of life, to aspire. The thoughtful child had all his mind thus pre-occupied; he was early, it might almost seem intuitively, trained to this course of life; wherever there was gentleness, modesty, the timidity of young passion, repugnance to vice, an imaginative temperament, a consciousness of unfitness to wrestle with the rough realities of life, the way lay invitingly open—the difficult, it is true, and painful, but direct and unerring way, to heaven. It lay through perils, but was made attractive by perpetual wonders; it was awful, but in its awfulness lay its power over the young mind. It learned to trample down that last bond which united the child to common humanity, filial reverence; the fond and mysterious attachment of the child and the mother, the inborn reverence of the son to the father. It is the highest praise of St. Fulgentius that he overcame his mother's tenderness by religious cruelty.

'History, to be true, must condescend to speak the language of legend; the belief of the times is part of the record of the times; and, though there may occur what may baffle its more calm and searching philosophy, it must not disdain that which was the primal, almost universal, motive of human life.

'Benedict was born at Nursia, in the province of Spoleto, of respectable parents. He was sent to Rome, according to still-prevailing custom, to be instructed in the liberal arts. But his pure spirit shrunk instinctively from the vices of the capital. He gave up the perilous study of letters, and preferred a holy ignorance. He fled secretly from the society of his dangerous associates, from the house of his parents, who, it seems, had accompanied him, as of old the father of Horace his son, to Rome. His faithful nurse alone discovered his design and accompanied his flight. This incident seems to imply that his flight took place at a very tender age; a circumstance, told at a later period, intimates that it was not before the first

impulses of youthful passion. He took refuge in a small village called *Effide*, about two miles from *Subiaco*. The rustic inhabitants, pleased with his modesty and sweetness of disposition, allowed him to inhabit a cell near their church. Here took place his first miracle. The faithful nurse, *Cyrilla*, had borrowed a stone sieve, commonly used in that part of the country to make bread. It fell from her hands, and broke in two. *Benedict*, moved by her distress, united the two pieces, prayed over them, and the vessel became whole. The wondering rustics are said to have hung the miraculously restored sieve over their church door. But the sensitive youth shrunk from fame, as he had from vice: he sought a deeper solitude. In the neighbourhood of *Subiaco*, by the advice and assistance of a monk, named *Romanus*, he found a wild and inaccessible cavern, into which he crept, and for three years the softly and delicately educated boy lay hid in this cold and dismal dwelling from the sight of men. His scanty food was supplied by *Romanus*, who took it by stealth from his own small pittance in his monastery. The cave was at the foot of the hill on which the monastery stood, but there was no path down the precipitous rock. The food, therefore, was let down by a rope, and a small bell tied to the rope gave notice of its coming. Once the devil broke the rope; but he could not baffle the inventive charity of *Romanus*. To an imagination so prepared, what scene could be more suited to nurture the disposition to wonders and visions than the wild and romantic region about *Subiaco*? The cave of *Benedict* is still shown as a hallowed place, high on the crest of a toppling rock, with the *Anio* roaring beneath in a deep ravine, clothed with the densest forest, and looking on another wild, precipitous crag. Half way up the zigzag and laborious path stands the convent of *Benedict's* sister, *St. Scolastica*. So entirely was *Benedict* cut off from the world that he ceased to mark not merely the progress of ordinary time, but even the fasts and festivals of the Church. A certain priest had prepared for himself some food of unusual delicacy for the festival of *Easter*. A mysterious admonition within his heart reproved him for this luxurious indulgence, while the servant of God was pining with hunger. Who he was, this holy and heaven-designated servant, or where he dwelt, the priest knew not, but he was led through the tangled thickets and over the rugged rocks to the cave of *Benedict*. *Benedict* was ignorant that it was *Easter*, and not till he was assured that it was that festal day, would he share in the heaven-sent banquet.

'The secret of his hiding-place was thus betrayed, and some of the rude shepherds of the country, seeing the hermit in his coarse attire, which was no more than a sheep-skin thrown round him, mistook him at first for a wild beast: but when they approached him, they were so melted by his gentle eloquence, that their hearts yielded at once, and they were subdued to courtesy of manners and Christian belief. . . .

'Three virtues constituted the sum of the *Benedictine* discipline. Silence with solitude and seclusion, humility, obedience, which, in the strong language of its laws, extended to impossibilities. All is thus concentrated on self. It was the man isolated from his kind who was to rise to a lonely perfection. All the social, all patriotic virtues were excluded: the mere mechanic observance of the rules of the brotherhood, or even the corporate spirit, are hardly worthy of notice, though they are the only substitutes for the rejected and proscribed pursuits of active life.

'The three occupations of life were the worship of God, reading, and manual labour. The adventitious advantages, and great they were, of these industrious agricultural settlements, were not contemplated by the founder; the object of the monks was not to make the wilderness blossom with fertility, to extend the arts and husbandry of civilised

life into barbarous regions, it was solely to employ in engrossing occupation that portion of time which could not be devoted to worship and to study.

'For the divine service the monks awoke at midnight; they retired again, and rose after a brief repose for matins. After matins they did not return to their beds, but spent the time in reading, meditation, or the singing of psalms. From prime to noon, and all after the brief meal, and another period of reading or meditation, was devoted to labour. At particular periods, as at harvest, the labouring brothers did not return home to their religious service; they knelt and performed it in the fields. The mass was not celebrated on ordinary days, only on Sundays and holidays.

'Abstinence from flesh, at least that of four-footed animals, was perpetual and universal; from that of fowls was prescribed with less rigour. The usual food was vegetable broth, bread, and a small measure of wine. From Easter to Pentecost there was no fast. From Pentecost to the ides of September, fasts on two days in the week; the rest of the year to Easter perpetual fast, with one evening meal of eggs or fish. Lent was still more rigorously enforced by abstinence not from food only, but from sleep and from speech. The punishment of delinquents was sequestration from the oratory, the table, and the common meetings; the contumacious and incorrigible were expelled from the community. The monastery contained within its walls the mill, the bakehouse, and everything necessary for life. It was strictly forbidden to partake of food without the walls; all wandering to any distance was prohibited; and if the monk was obliged to be absent during the whole day, he was enjoined to fast rather than partake of food abroad. . . .

'The vision of St. Benedict of the universal diffusion of his order was accomplished with a rapidity wonderful even in those times. In Italy, from Calabria to the Alps, Benedictine monasteries began to rise on the brows of beetling mountains, sometimes in quiet valleys. Their buildings gradually grew in spaciousness and splendour; nor did they absolutely abandon the cities, as dangerous to themselves or beyond the sphere of their exemplary rigour. Few, if any, of the great towns are without their Benedictine convent. Every monastery sent forth its colonies. The monks seem to multiply with greater fecundity than the population of the most flourishing cities, and were obliged to throw off their redundant brethren to some new settlement. They swarmed, according to their language, like bees. Wherever was the abode of men was the abode of these recluses, who had put off the ordinary habits, attire, occupations of men; wherever they settled in the troubled wilderness men gathered around them, as if to partake of their sanctity and security. Maurus, the faithful friend and associate of Benedict, had crossed the Alps even before his death. Bishop Innocent, of Le Mans, who had invited him to Gaul, had died before his arrival; but he was hospitably received in Orleans. The first Benedictine monastery in France rose at Glanfeuille, on the Loire, not far from Angers; it was but the first of many rich and noble foundations—foundations which, as they grew in wealth and splendour, and, in consequence, in luxury and ease, were either themselves brought back by some stern reformer, who wrought them up to their old austere discipline, or rivalled and supplanted by new monasteries, which equalled or surpassed the rigour of Benedict himself. The name of St. Maur is dear to letters. Should his disciples have in some degree departed from the iron rule of their founder, the world, even the enlightened Christian world, will pardon them if their profound and useful studies have withdrawn them from mechanical and automatic acts of devotion. In Spain the monasteries mostly fell in the general wreck of Christianity on the Mahommedan conquest; few scanty and

doubtful records survived, to be gleaned by the industry of their successors, as Christianity slowly won back the land.

‘With St. Augustine the rule of St. Benedict passed to England; but there it might seem as if the realm, instead of banishing them, or permitting their self-banishment, to the wild heath or the mountain crest, had chosen for them, or allowed them to choose, the fairest spots in the land for their settlements. In every rich valley, by the side of every clear and deep stream, arose a Benedictine Abbey. The labours of the monks in planting, in cultivation, in laying out the sunny garden, or hanging the hill with trees, may have added much to the picturesque grace of these scenes; but, in general, if a district in England be surveyed, the most convenient, most fertile, most peaceful spot, will be found to have been the site of a Benedictine abbey.

‘Their numbers at any one time it may be difficult to estimate. Abbeys rose and fell, like other human institutions; the more favoured, however, handed down the sacred tradition of their foundation, of their endowments, of their saints, of their miracles, of their good deeds to civilisation, till the final wreck of monastic institutions during the last century; and even from that wreck a few have survived, or lifted up again their venerable heads.’—Vol. i. pp. 414—426.

The following passage, at the opening of the pontificate of Gregory the Great, shows the manner in which Dr. Milman regards the Papal power as produced by, and adapted to, the wants of the age:—

‘Now was the crisis in which the Papacy, the only power which lay not entirely and absolutely prostrate before the disasters of the times—which had an inherent strength, and might resume its majesty—the power which was most imperatively required to preserve that which was to survive out of the crumbling wreck of Roman civilisation, must re-awaken its obscured and suspended life. To Western Christianity was absolutely necessary a centre, standing alone, strong in traditionary reverence, and in acknowledged claims to supremacy. Even the perfect organisation of the Christian hierarchy might in all human probability have fallen to pieces in perpetual conflict: it might have degenerated into a half secular feudal caste, with hereditary benefices more and more entirely subservient to the civil power, a priesthood of each nation or each tribe, and gradually sinking to the intellectual or religious level of the nation or tribe. On the rise of a power both controlling and conservative, hung, humanly speaking, the life and death of Christianity—of Christianity as a permanent, aggressive, expansive, and, to a certain extent, uniform system. There must be a counterbalance to barbaric force, to the unavoidable anarchy of Teutonism, with its tribal, or at the utmost national independence, forming a host of small, conflicting, antagonistic kingdoms. All Europe had been what England was under the Octarchy, what Germany was when her emperors were weak; and even her emperors she owed to Rome, to the Church, to Christianity. Providence might have otherwise ordained it, but it is impossible for man to imagine by what other organising or consolidating force the commonwealth of the Western nations could have grown up to a discordant, indeed, and conflicting league, but still to a league, with that unity and conformity of manners, usages, laws, religion, which have made their rivalries, oppugnancies, and even their long ceaseless wars, on the whole to issue in the noblest, highest, most intellectual form of civilisation known to man. It is inconceivable that Teutonic Europe, or Europe so deeply interpenetrated with Teutonism, could have been condensed or compelled into a vast Asiatic despotism, or succession of despotisms. Immense and interminable

as have been the evils and miseries of the conflict between the southern and northern, the Teutonic and Roman, the hierarchical and civil elements of our social system, out of these conflicts has at length arisen the balance and harmony of the great states which constitute European Christendom, and are now peopling other continents with kindred and derivative institutions. It is impossible to conceive what had been the confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the middle ages, without the mediæval Papacy; and of the mediæval Papacy the real father is Gregory the Great. In all his predecessors there was much of the uncertainty and indefiniteness of a new dominion. Christianity had converted the Western world—it had by this time transmuted it: in all except the Roman law, it was one with it. Even Leo the Great had something of the Roman dictator. Gregory is the Roman altogether merged in the Christian bishop. It is a Christian dominion, of which he lays the foundations in the Eternal City, not the old Rome associating Christian influence to her ancient title of sovereignty.

‘Gregory united in himself every qualification and endowment which could command the veneration and attachment of Rome and of his age. In his descent he blended civil and ecclesiastical nobility. He was of a senatorial family: his father bore the imperial name of Gordian, his mother that of Sylvia. A pope (Felix II.) was his ancestor in the fourth degree—the pope who had built the church of SS. Cosmos and Damianus, close to the temple of Romulus. Two sainted virgins, Thirsilla and Sylvia, were his aunts. To his noble descent was added considerable wealth; and all that wealth, directly he became master of it by the death of his father, was at once devoted to religious uses. He founded and endowed, perhaps from Sicilian estates, six monasteries in that island; a seventh, in Rome, he chose for his own retreat; and having lavished on the poor all his costly robes, his silk, his gold, his jewels, his furniture, he violently wrenched himself from the secular life (in which he had already attained to the dignity of prætor of the city), and not even assuming the abbacy of his convent, but beginning with the lowest monastic duties, he devoted himself altogether to God. His whole time was passed in prayer, reading, writing, and dictation. The fame of his unprecedented abstinence and boundless charity spread abroad, and, as usual, took the form of miracle. He had so destroyed his health by fasting, vigil, and study, that his brethren were obliged to feed him by compulsion. His life hung on a thread, and he feared that he should not have strength to observe the indispensable fast even on Good Friday. By the prayers of the holy Eleutherius his stomach was endowed with supernatural strength, and never after (he had manifestly, however, undermined his constitution) refused the sacred duty of abstinence. His charity was tried by an angel in the garb of a shipwrecked sailor, whose successive visits exhausted all he had, except a silver vessel set apart for the use of his mother. This, too, he gave, and the satisfied angel at length revealed himself. The monastery of St. Andrew was a perpetual scene of preternatural wonder. Fugitive monks were seized upon by devils, who confessed their power to Gregory; others were favoured with visits of angels summoning them to peace; and one brother, whose whole life, excepting the intervals of food and sleep, was spent in psalmody, was not merely crowned by invisible hands with white flowers, but fourteen years after, a fragrance, as of the concentrated sweetness of all flowers, breathed from his tomb. Such was the poetry of those days.’—Vol. i. pp. 429—432.

We have not space to extract more respecting the character of this great man. Great in every respect: as a doctor, a ruler, a saint, and to us especially interesting as the apostle of England, seeing that the conversion of our forefathers is owing no

less to the labours of Augustine, than to the zeal, wisdom, and firmness of S. Gregory himself. At this point the third portion of the History of Latin Christianity ends. The third step has been made, and the Bishop of Rome is become the father in Christ, and the spiritual ruler of the races who are destined to become the greatest people of the world. He is the spiritual father and ruler of Europe.

IV. But while the Gospel was subjecting these barbarian races to its sway, and preparing the way for the enlargement of the empire of Christ over the new nations that are springing into distinct life, a movement in the distant south, 'no bigger than a man's hand,' swells into a tempest which sweeps over the earliest and, as they once were, the fairest portions of the Christian Church. The history of Mohammed, the nature of the religion which bears his name, the narrative of its successes, form two very interesting and beautiful chapters of the next portion of our history, which extends from the time of Gregory I. to the crowning of Charlemagne, that is, over the space of two hundred years. The history of the Roman Church itself during that period is marked by comparatively few incidents of importance; but although the very existence of the Roman Church again and again seemed to be threatened, the changes which were going on among the nations of the world, the controversies of the Eastern Church, and the conversion of the northern tribes, contributed to establish it on a firmer basis. These two centuries witnessed the rise and progress and victories of Mohammedanism. It had no existence when they begun; when they ended it was established in Syria, Palestine, Africa, and Spain, and the tide was only turned back from France by the bravery of Charles Martel.

In this period, the author diversifies the narrative, which, if confined to the history of the Roman Church, would be very uninteresting, by some of the most pleasing episodic chapters of the work. Two, as we have said, are devoted to Mohammedanism; two to the Christianity of our own country, the account of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons and the history of their religion, which was the fairest and brightest portion of the Christianity of these two centuries; then a chapter to the conversion of the Teutonic races beyond the Roman empire by the labours of S. Columban, S. Gall, and S. Boniface:

'It is difficult to conceive the motives which led forth these first pious wanderers from their native land. Columban, at his outset, was no missionary, urged by a passionate or determined zeal to convert Pagan nations to the Cross of Christ; nor was he a pilgrim, lured forth from his retreat by the unconquerable desire of visiting the scenes of apostolic labours, the spiritual wonders of Rome, or to do homage to the relics of Saints or Apostles. He and his followers seemed only to seek a safe retreat, in

which he might shroud his solitary devotion; or, if his ascetic fame should gather around him an increasing number of disciples, form a cœnobitic establishment. They might have found, it might be supposed, retirement not less secure against secular intrusion, as wild, as silent, as holy, in the yet peaceful Ireland, or in the Scottish islands, as in the mountains of the Vosges, or the valleys of the Alps.

‘But the influence of Columban, as the parent of so many important monasteries on the borders and within the frontier of Teutonic Paganism, as well as the reverence with which his holy character was invested, and which enabled him to assert the moral dignity of Christianity with such intrepidity, are events which strongly mark the religious history of this age. The stranger monk issues from his retreat to rebuke the vices of kings, confronts the cruel Brunehaut; and such is the fearful sanctity which environs the man of God, that even her deadly hostility can venture nothing beyond his banishment.

‘Columban was born in Leinster, at the period when Ireland is described as a kind of Hesperian elysium of peace and piety. His early aspirations after monastic holiness were fostered in the convent of Banchor, on the coast of Ulster. He became a proficient in the mystic piety of the day. But he was suddenly seized with the desire of foreign travel; he wrung an unwilling consent to his departure from his spiritual father, Comgal, abbot of Banchor. He just touched on, but shrunk from the contaminated shores of Paganised Britain, and landed in Gaul. The fame of his piety reached the ears of one of the kings of the land: all that Columban requested was permission to retire into some unapproachable wilderness.

‘The woody mountains of the Vosges rose on the frontiers of the kingdoms of Austrasia and of Burgundy. Tribes of Pagan Suevians then occupied that part of Switzerland which bordered on those kingdoms. War and devastation had restored as solitudes to nature districts which had been reclaimed to culture and fertility by the industry of Roman colonists. It was on the site of ancient towns that hermits now found their wildernesses. Columban, with his twelve followers, first settled among the ruins of a small town called Anegratis. The woods yielded herbs and roots and the bark of trees for food, the streams water and probably fish. But the offerings of piety were not wanting; provisions were sent by those who were desirous of profiting by the prayers of these holy men. But the heart of Columban yearned for still more profound solitude. In the depths of the wild woods, about seven miles off, as he wandered with his book, he found a cave, of which the former inhabitant, a bear, gave up quiet possession to the saint—for the wild beasts, wolves as well as bears, and the Pagan Suevians, respected the man of God. Miracle as usual arose around the founder of a monastery. The fame of the piety and wonder-working powers of Columban gathered a still increasing number of votaries; the ruins of Anegratis could no longer contain the candidates for the monastic life.

‘About eight miles distant lay the more extensive ruins of a fortified Roman town, Luxovium, now overgrown with the wild forest jungle, but formerly celebrated for its warm springs. Amid the remains of splendid baths and other stately buildings, Columban determined to establish a more regular monastery. The forest around is said to have been strewn with marble statues, and magnificent vestiges of the old Pagan worship. On this wreck of heathenism rose the monastery of Luxeuil. Neophytes crowded from all parts; the nobles of the court threw off their arms, or fled from the burthensome duties of civil life to this holy retreat. A second establishment became necessary, and in a beautiful spot, watered by several streams, rose the succursal abbey of Fontaines. Columban presided as abbot over all these institutions; his delight was ever to wander alone in

the woods, or to dwell for days in his lonely cave: but he still exercised strict superintendence over all the monasteries of the Rule which he had formed; he mingled in and encouraged their useful labours in husbandry, it was thought, with more than human wisdom and sagacity.

‘But peace was not to be found even in the lonely forests of the Vosges. After twelve years of undisturbed repose, religious disputes invaded the quiet shades of Luxeuil. Columban was arraigned before a synod of Gaulish bishops for his heterodox usage about keeping Easter, in which he adhered to the old British discipline. Columban answered with a kind of pathetic dignity, “I am not the author of this difference. I came as a stranger to this land for the sake of our common Lord and Saviour Christ. I beseech you by that common Lord who shall judge us all, to allow me to live in silence, in peace, and in charity, as I have lived for twelve years, beside the bones of my seventeen departed brethren. Let Gaul receive into her bosom all those who, if they deserve it, will be received into the kingdom of heaven.”

‘Columban had to wage a nobler strife against the vices of the neighbouring court.’—Vol. ii. pp. 100—103.

After some further narrative which we must omit, we read:—

‘Thus these Irish monks were not merely reinvigorating the decaying monastic spirit, which perhaps was languishing from the extreme severity of the rule of Cassianus, chiefly followed in the monasteries of Gaul, but they were winning back districts which had been won from Roman civilisation by advancing barbarism. Monasteries replace ruined Roman cities. From them issued almost a race of saints, the founders of some of the most important establishments within or on the borders of the old Roman territory: Magnus and Theodorus, the first abbots of Kempton and of Fussen; Attalus of Bobbio; St. Romaric of Remiremont; St. Omer, St. Bertin, St. Amand, the apostles of Flanders; St. Wandrille, the founder of Fontenelle, in Normandy. Gradually the great establishments, founded on the rule of Columban, dropped the few peculiarities of discipline which distinguished them from the Roman Church; they retained those of their rule, which differed from that which was now beginning to prevail throughout western Christendom. Yet there was nothing of great importance to distinguish them from the Benedictine foundations; their rule, habits, studies (all, perhaps, but their dress) were those of western monasticism.’—Vol. ii. p. 108.

From these more interesting stories we come to the history of the Papacy from Gregory I. to Gregory II.—the period of the Monothelite controversies, marked by the fall of Honorius and the cruelties inflicted on Martin. Italy during this period was subject to the Emperor of the East, and the position of the pontiffs was lowered even to the greatest humiliation. The Iconoclastic controversies followed, the narrative of which is vivid and of sustained interest. The following passage shows the tone of the writer with respect to the subject of the controversy:—

‘The eighth century gave birth to a religious contest, in its origin, in its nature, and in its important political consequences entirely different from all those which had hitherto distracted Christendom. Iconoclasm was an attempt of the Eastern Emperor to change by his own arbitrary command the religion of his subjects. No religious revolution has ever been successful which has commenced with the government. Such revolu-

tions have ever begun] in the middle or lower orders of society, struck on some responsive chord of sympathy in the general feeling, supplied some religious want, stirred some religious energy, and shaken the inert strength of the established faith by some stronger counter emotion. Whatever the motives of the Emperor Leo the Isaurian (and on this subject, as in all the religious controversies where the writings of the unsuccessful party were carefully suppressed or perished through neglect, authentic history is almost silent), whether he was actuated by a rude aversion to what perhaps can hardly yet be called the fine arts with which Christianity was associating itself, or by a spiritual disdain and impatience of the degrading superstition into which the religion of the Gospel had so long been degenerating, the attempt was as politically unwise and unseasonable as the means employed were despotic and altogether unequal to the end. The time was past, if it had ever been, when an imperial edict could change, or even much affect, the actual prevailing religion of the empire. For this was no speculative article of belief, no question of high metaphysical theology, but a total change in the universal popular worship, in the spirit and in the essence, if not of the daily ritual, of countless observances and habitual practices of devotion. It swept away from almost all the churches of the Empire objects hallowed by devotion, and supposed to be endowed with miraculous agency; objects of hope and fear, of gratitude and immemorial veneration. It not merely invaded the public church, and left its naked walls without any of the old remembrances of faith and piety; it reached the private sanctuary of prayer. No one could escape the proscription; learned or unlearned, priest or peasant, monk or soldier, clergyman or layman, man, woman, and even child, were involved in the strife. Something to which their religious attachments clung, to which their religious passions were wedded, might at any time be forcibly rent away, insulted, trampled under foot; that which had been their pride and delight could only now be furtively visited, and under the fear of detection.

'Nor was it possible for this controversy to vent itself in polemic writings; to exhaust the mutual hatred which it engendered in fierce invectives, which, however they might provoke, were not necessarily followed by acts of conflict and bloodshed. Here actual, personal, furious collision of man and man, of faction and faction, of armed troops against armed troops, was inevitable. The contending parties did not assail each other with mutual anathemas, which they might despise, or excommunication and counter-excommunication, the validity of which might be questioned by either party. On one side it was a sacred obligation to destroy, to mutilate, to dash to pieces, to deface the objects on which the other had so long gazed with intense devotion, and which he might think it an equally sacred obligation to defend at the sacrifice of life. It was not a controversy, it was a feud; not a polemic strife, but actual war declared by one part of Christendom against the other. It was well perhaps for Christendom that the parties were not more equally balanced; that, right or wrong, one party in that division of the Christian world, where total change would have been almost extermination, obtained a slow but complete triumph.

'In all the controversies, moreover, in which the Emperors had been involved, whether they had plunged into them of their own accord, or had been compelled to take a reluctant part;—whether they embraced the orthodox or the erroneous opinions,—they had found a large faction, both of the clergy and the people, already enlisted in the cause. In this case they had to create their own faction; and though so many of the clergy, from conviction, fear, or interest, became Iconoclasts, as to form a council respectable for its numbers; though, among some part of the people, an

Iconoclastic fanaticism broke out, yet it was no spontaneous movement on their part. The impulse, to all appearance, emanated directly from the emperor. It was not called forth by any general expression of aversion to the existing superstition by any body of the clergy, or by any single bold reformer: it was announced, it was enacted in that character of Supreme Head of the Empire, which was still supposed to be vested in the Cæsar, and had descended to him as part of his inheritance from his pagan predecessors. This sovereignty comprehended religious as well as temporal autocracy; and of this the clergy, though they had often resisted it, and virtually, perhaps, held it to be abrogated, had never formally, publicly, or deliberately, declined the jurisdiction. It is a proof of the strong will and commanding abilities of the great Iconoclastic Emperors, that they could effect, and so long maintain, such a revolution, by their sole authority, throughout at least their eastern dominions.

And there was this irremediable weakness in the cause of Iconoclasm. It was a mere negative doctrine, a proscription of those sentiments which had full possession of the popular mind, without any strong countervailing religious excitement. There was none of that appeal to principles like those of the Reformation, to the Bible, to justification by faith, to the individual sense of responsibility. The senses were robbed of their habitual and cherished objects of devotion, but there was no awakening of an inner life of intense and passionate piety. The cold naked walls from whence the Scriptural histories had been effaced, the despoiled shrines, the mutilated images, could not compel the mind to a more pure and immaterial conception of God and the Saviour. It was a premature Rationalism, enforced upon an unreasoning age—an attempt to spiritualise by law and edict a generation which had been unspiritualised by centuries of materialistic devotion. Hatred of images, in the process of the strife, might become, as it did, a fanaticism—it could never become a religion. Iconoclasm might proscribe idolatry, but it had no power of kindling a purer faith.

The consequences of this new religious dissension were of the utmost political importance, both in the East and in the West. In the East, instead of consolidating the strength of Christendom in one great confederacy against invading Mohammedanism, it distracted the thoughts of men from their more pressing dangers, weakened the military energy which, under the Isaurian race of emperors, seemed likely to revive, depopularised with at least one half of their subjects, sovereigns of such great ability as Leo and Constantine Copronymus (whose high qualities for empire pierce through the clouds which are spread over their names by hostile annalists); and finally by adding a new element of animosity to the domestic intrigues within the palace, interrupted the regular succession, and darkened the annals of the empire with new crimes.

But its more important results were the total disruption of the bond between the East and the West—the severance of the Italian province from the Byzantine Empire; the great accession of power to the Papacy, which took the lead in this revolution; the introduction of the Frankish kings into the politics of Italy; and eventually the establishment of the Western Empire under Charlemagne.

Yet this question, thus prematurely agitated by the Iconoclastic emperors, and at this period of Christianity so fatally mistimed, is one of the most grave, and, it should seem, inevitable controversies, arising out of our religion. It must be judged by a more calm and profound philosophy than could be possible in times of actual strife between two impassioned and adverse factions. It is a conflict of two great principles, which it is difficult to reconcile. On the one hand, there can be no doubt that with

ignorant and superstitious minds, the use, the reverence, the worship of images, whether in pictures or statues, invariably degenerates into idolatry. The Church may draw fine and aerial distinctions between images as objects of reverence and objects of adoration; as incentives to the worship of more remote and immaterial beings, or as actual indwelling deities; it may nicely define the feeling which images ought to awaken;—but the intense and indiscriminating piety of the vulgar either understands not, or utterly disregards these subtleties: it may refuse to sanction, it cannot be said not to encourage, that devotion which cannot and will not weigh and measure either its emotions or its language. Image worship in the mass of the people, of the whole monkhood at this time, was undeniably the worship of the actual, material, present image, rather than that of the remote, formless, or spiritual power, of which it was the emblem or representative. It has continued, and still continues, to be in many parts of Christendom this gross and unspiritual adoration; it is a part of the general system of divine worship. The whole tendency of popular belief was to localise, to embody in the material thing the supernatural or divine power; the healing or miraculous influence dwelt in, and emanated from, the picture of the saint—the special, individual picture—it was contained within the relic, and flowed directly from it. These outward things were not mere occasional vehicles of the divine bounty, indifferent in themselves, they possessed an inherent, inalienable sanctity. Where the image was, there was the saint; he heard the prayer, he was carried in procession to allay the pestilence, to arrest the conflagration, to repel the enemy; he sometimes resumed the functions of life, smiled or stretched his hand from the wall. An image of the same saint, or of the Virgin, rivalled another image in its wonder-working power, or its mild benignity.

‘On the other hand, is pure and spiritual Christianity—the highest Christianity to which the human mind can attain—implacably and irreconcilably hostile to the Fine Arts? Is that influence of the majestic and the beautiful awakened through the senses by form, colour, and expression, to be altogether abandoned? Can the exaltation, the purification of the human soul by Art in no way be allied with true Christian devotion? Is that aid to the realisation of the historic truths of our religion, by representations, vivid, speaking, almost living, to be utterly proscribed? Is that idealism which grows out of and nourishes reverential feelings, to rest solely on the contemplation of pure spirit, without any intermediate human, yet superhumanised, form? Because the ignorant or fraudulent monk has ascribed miraculous power to his Madonna, or the image of his patron saint, and the populace have knelt before it in awe which it is impossible to distinguish from adoration, is Christianity to cast off as alien to its highest development, the divine creations of Raffaele, or of Correggio? Are we inexorably to demand the same sublime spiritualism from the more or less imaginative races or classes of mankind?

‘This great question lies indeed at the bottom of the antagonism between those two descriptions of believers; to a certain extent, between the religion of southern and that of northern Europe, between that of the races of Roman and some of those of Teutonic descent; to a certain extent that of the inhabitants of towns or villages, and rude mountaineers; finally, between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.

‘But since, in the progress of civilisation, the fine arts will no doubt obtain, if not greater influence, more general admiration, religion must either break off entirely all association with these dangerous friends, and the fine arts abandon the most fertile and noblest field for their development; or their mutual relations must be amicably adjusted; a finer sense of their inherent harmony must arise; the blended feelings which they

excite must poise themselves far above the vulgar superstition of idolatry while they retain the force and intensity of devotional reverence. The causes which may be expected to work this sacred reconciliation may be the growing intelligence of mankind, greater familiarity with the written Scriptures; and, paradoxical as it may sound, but as may hereafter appear, greater perfection in the arts themselves, or a finer apprehension of that perfection in ancient as in modern art.'—Vol. ii. pp. 144—150.

The result of this controversy was the raising the power and influence of the Roman See; as Pope Gregory II. asserted and vindicated in steady opposition to the Emperor the propriety of retaining images. It is interesting as bringing out one of the last great writers of the Greek Church—John Damascene—whose history exhibits the condition of the Christians under the Mohammedan rule. The further progress of the controversy is then narrated, and then the severance of the Greek and Latin Churches under the two Gregories, which resulted in the appeal of Gregory the Third to Charles Martel, on whom the attention of all Europe centered as the liberator of the West from the 'all-conquering Mohammedans.'

'These acts of Gregory III. mark the period of transition from the old to the new political system of Europe. They proclaimed the severance of all connexion with the East. The Pope, as an independent potentate, is forming an alliance with a Transalpine sovereign for the liberation of Italy, and thus taking the lead in that total revolution in the great social system of Europe, the influence of which still survives in the relations between the Transalpine nations and Italy. The step to papal aggrandisement, though yet unpremeditated, is immense. Latin Christendom is forming into a separate realm, of which the Pope is the head. Henceforth the Pope, if not yet a temporal sovereign, is a temporal potentate.'—Vol. ii. p. 217.

At this point the author returns to trace briefly the history of the hierarchy of France during the time of the later Merovingian kings, to introduce us to the relations between the clergy and the mayors of the palace, and continues the history of the Papacy after the death of Charles Martel during the times of Pepin and those of Charlemagne, when the new dynasty stood out as the defenders of Rome against the Lombards. In it we mark the following passage, referring to the time of Pope Zacharias in the middle of the eighth century:—

'Thus for a short time longer the wreck of the imperial dominions in Italy was preserved by the sole influence, the religious eloquence and authority, of the unarmed Bishop of Rome. But such was the power of religion in those times, that not merely did it enable the clergy to dictate their policy to armed and powerful sovereigns, to arrest Barbarian invasion, and to snatch, as it were, conquests already in their rapacious hands; in every quarter of Western Europe kings were seen abdicating their thrones, placing themselves at the feet of the Pope as humble penitents, casting off their pomp, and submitting to the privations and the discipline of monks.

'It has been related that when Columban, some years before, endeav-

voured 'to persuade the Merovingian Theodebert to abandon his throne and become an ecclesiastic, the whole assembly burst out into scornful laughter. "Was it ever heard that a Merovingian king had degraded himself into a priest?" The saint had replied, "He who disdains to become an ecclesiastic will become so against his will." The times had rapidly changed. From all parts of Western Christendom kings were coming, lowly penitents, to Rome, to lay aside the vain pomp of royalty, to assume the coarse attire, the total seclusion, and, as they hoped, the undisturbed and heaven-winning peace of the cloister. Ceolwulf is said to have been the eighth Anglo-Saxon prince who became a monk. Now, within a few years, from the thrones of France and of Lombardy, the kings descended of their own accord, and laid their temporal government down before the head of Christendom, and entreated permission to devote the rest of their lives to the spiritual state.

'Carloman, the elder son of Charles Martel, had commenced his reign with vigour, ability, and success. On a sudden he cast off at once the duties and the dignity of his station, and surrendered to Pepin, his brother, the power and all the ambitious hopes of his family. Carloman left his country, appeared in Italy, humbly requested to be admitted into the monastic state, built a monastery on Mount Soracte, but finding that too near to Rome, retired to the more profound seclusion of Monte Casino. In that solitude the heir of Charles Martel hoped to pass the rest of his earthly days.

'But Pope Zacharias beheld even a greater triumph of the faith. A Lombard king suddenly paused on the full tide of ambition and success, and from a deadly and formidable enemy of the Pope and of the Roman interest, became a peaceful monk.'—Vol. ii. pp. 231, 232.

V. The next period carries us from the time of Charlemagne through two centuries and a-half (from A.D. 800 to A.D. 1044), the early part of which was marked by great Popes—Leo IV., Nicolas I., and Hadrian II.—and by great events, while the latter part exhibits the darkest period of that Church's history, when the Papacy had sunk into the lowest state of degradation. The history of the state of the Church under Charlemagne, and his legislation, occupy a prominent place. Indeed, during all this period it is the French portion of the Church that exhibits the most life and vigour. The schools of Charlemagne awakened the minds of men. Hence it was with the French Church, most particularly under Hincmar, that the Popes had to contend. They had, indeed, other contests. The Saracens invaded Italy, and occupied the suburbs of Rome itself. The great struggle with Photius, about the See of Constantinople, followed. Nicolas and Hadrian conducted the contests both with Constantinople and France. The severance of Rome from Constantinople, and its uncontested preeminence, was the result of the one: the forged Decretals—which permanently fixed on the Church all the power which the Popes then claimed, with the authority of the apostolic age and the first three centuries—were brought into prominence in the second. Dean Milman's character of Nicolas, and his statements on this subject, are characterised by great fairness:—

During all his conflicts in the West with the royal and with the episcopal power, the moral and religious sympathies of mankind could not but be on his side. If his language was occasionally more violent, even contemptuous, than became the moderation which, up to this time, had mitigated the papal decrees, he might plead lofty and righteous indignation: if he interfered with domestic relations, it was in defence of the innocent and defenceless, and in vindication of the sanctity of marriage: if he treated kings with scorn, it was because they had become contemptible for their weakness or their vices: if he interfered with episcopal or metropolitan jurisdiction, the inferior clergy, even bishops, would be pleased to have a remote and possibly disinterested tribunal, to which they might appeal from prelates, chosen only from aristocratic connexions, barbarians in occupation and in ferocity: if he was inexorable to transgressors, it was to those of the highest order, prelates who had lent themselves to injustice and iniquity, and had defied his power: if he annulled councils, those councils had already been condemned for their injustice, had deserved the reproachful appellation with which they were branded by the Pope, with all who had any innate or unperverted sentiment of justice and purity. Hence the presumptuous usurpation even of divine power, so long as it was thus beneficently used, awed, confounded all, and offended few; men took no alarm at the arrogance which befriended them against the oppressor and the tyrant.

The impression left by Nicolas I. on his times may be estimated by the words of a later writer. "Since the days of Gregory I. to our time sat no high-priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicolas. He tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign: to holy bishops and clergy he was mild and gentle; to the wicked and unconverted a terror; so that we might truly say a new Elias arose in him."

But this vast moral advancement of the popedom was not all which the Roman See owes to Nicolas I.; she owes the questionable boon of the recognition of the False Decretals as the law of the Church.

Nicolas I. not only saw during his pontificate the famous False Decretals take their place in the jurisprudence of Latin Christendom; if he did not promulgate, he assumed them as authentic documents; he gave them the weight of the papal sanction; and with their aid prostrated at his feet the one great Transalpine prelate who could still maintain the independence of the Teutonic Church, Hincmar Archbishop of Rheims.

Up to this period the Decretals, the letters or edicts of the Bishops of Rome, according to the authorised or common collection of Dionysius, commenced with Pope Siricius, towards the close of the fourth century. To the collection of Dionysius was added that of the authentic councils, which bore the name of Isidore of Seville. On a sudden was promulgated, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently overawing at once all doubt, a new Code, which to the former authentic documents added fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest popes from Clement to Melchiades, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part, among the decrees of the Popes and of the councils from Silvester to Gregory II., thirty-nine false decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic councils. In this vast manual of sacerdotal Christianity the Popes appear from the first the parents, guardians, legislators of the faith throughout the world. The False Decretals do not merely assert the supremacy of the Popes—the dignity and privileges of the Bishop of Rome—they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity, and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on

Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the cross, the discovery of the relics of the Apostles; on the chrisam, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The whole is composed with an air of profound piety and reverence; a specious purity, and occasionally beauty, in the moral and religious tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifest design, the aggrandisement of the See of Rome and the aggrandisement of the whole clergy in subordination to the See of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable;—the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history. They are now given up by all; not a voice is raised in their favour; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their own day, and throughout the later history of Christianity.

'The author or authors of this most audacious and elaborate of pious frauds is unknown; the date and place of its compilation are driven into such narrow limits that they may be determined within a few years, and within a very circumscribed region. The False Decretals came not from Rome; the time of their arrival at Rome, after they were known beyond the Alps, appears almost certain.'—Vol. ii. pp. 372—375.

We must pass over some portion of the narrative:—

'It might occur to the most religious, that for the sake of religion; it might occur to those to whom the dignity and interest of the sacerdotal order were their religion, that some effort must be made to reinvest the clergy in their imperilled sanctity. There must be some appeal against this secular, this ecclesiastical tyranny: and whither should appeal be? It could not be to the Scriptures, to the Gospel; it must be to ancient and venerable tradition, to the unrepealed, irrepealable law of the Church; to remote and awful Rome. Rome must be proclaimed in an unusual, more emphatic manner, the eternal, immemorial court of appeal; the tradition must not rest on the comparatively recent names of Leo the Great, of Innocent the Great, of Siricius, or the right of appeal depend on the decree of the Council of Sardica; it must come down from the successors of St. Peter himself in unbroken succession; the whole clergy must have a perpetual, indefeasible sanctity of the same antiquity.

'So may the idea of this, to us it seems, monstrous fiction have dawned upon its author;—himself may have implicitly believed that he asserted no prerogative for Rome which Rome herself had not claimed, which he did not think to be her right. It is even now asserted, perhaps can hardly be disproved, that the False Decretals advanced no pretensions in favour of the See of Rome which had not been heard before in some vague and indefinite, but not therefore less significant, language. The boldness of the act was in the new authority in which it arrayed these pretensions. The author may have thought that in renewing the power, while he by no means lost sight of the holiness of the clergy, he was embarked in a hallowed cause. In some respects he shows skill at least as consummate as might be expected in that age. There was no great fear of detection in a fiction so advantageous to those who could alone expose it, the clergy, in

an age which, for instance, received the life of St. Denys, written by the Abbot Hilduin of that monastery, and the ecclesiastical counsellor of the emperor, as identified with Dionysius the Areopagite; a legend almost of unparalleled extravagance, but which became at once accredited hagiology. The new code was enshrined, as it were, in a framework of deeply religious thought and language; it was introduced under the venerated name of Isidore of Seville (it was rumoured to have been brought from Spain by Riculf, Archbishop of Mentz); it was thus attached to the authentic work of Isidore, which had long enjoyed undisputed authority. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, as the most powerful, so, perhaps, the most learned Transalpine ecclesiastic, who might at once have exposed the fiction, which he could hardly but know to be a fiction, co-operated more than any one else to establish its authority. So long as he supposed it to advance or confirm his own power, he suppressed all intrusive doubts; he discovered too late that it was a trap (a mousetrap is his own undignified word) to catch unwary metropolitans. Hincmar was caught, beyond all hope of escape. In the appeal of Rothrad, Bishop of Soissons, against Hincmar, metropolitan of Rheims, Pope Nicolas I. at first alleges no word of the new Decretals in favour of his right of appeal; he seemingly knows no older authority than that of Innocent, Leo, Siricius, and the Council of Sardica. The next year not merely is he fully master of the pseudo-Isidorian documents, but he taunts Hincmar with now calling in question, when it makes against him, authority which he was ready to acknowledge in confirmation of his own power. Hincmar is forced to the humiliation of submission. Rothrad, deposed by Hincmar, deposed by the Council of Senlis, is reinstated in his see.

‘This immediate, if somewhat cautious, adoption of the fiction, unquestionably not the forgery, by Pope Nicolas, appears to me less capable of charitable palliation than the original invention. It was, in truth, a strong temptation; but in Rome, where such documents had never been heard of, it is difficult to imagine by what arguments a man, not unlearned, could convince himself, or believe that he could convince himself, of their authenticity. Here was a long, continuous, unbroken series of letters, an accumulated mass of decrees of councils, of which the archives of Rome could show no vestige, of which the traditions of Rome were altogether silent: yet is there no holy indignation at fraud, no lofty reproof of those who dared to seat themselves in the pontifical chair and speak in the names of Pope after Pope. There is a deliberate, artful vindication of their authority. Reasons are alleged from which it is impossible to suppose that Nicolas himself believed their validity, on account of their acknowledged absence from the Roman archives. Nor did the successors of Nicolas betray any greater scruple in strengthening themselves by this welcome, and therefore only, unsuspecting aid. It is impossible to deny that, at least by citing without reserve or hesitation, the Roman pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud.

‘Nor must be overlooked, perhaps the more important result of the acceptance of the pseudo-Isidorian statutes as the universal, immemorial, irrevocable law of Christendom. It established the great principle which Nicolas I. had before announced, of the sole legislative power of the Pope. Every one of these papal epistles was a canon of the Church; every future bull therefore rested on the same irrefragable authority, commanded the same implicit obedience. The Papacy became a legislative as well as an administrative authority. Infallibility was the next inevitable step, if infallibility was not already in the power asserted to have been bestowed by the Lord on St. Peter, by St. Peter handed down in unbroken descent, and in a plenitude which could not be restricted or limited, to the latest of his successors.’—Vol. ii. pp. 377—380.

The advance made in the French Church during this period is very important—it was a great step in the progress of the Church generally, and prepared the way for the changes which followed. Indeed, the life of Hincmar, the controversies which arose in that branch of Christendom, the working of the human mind shown in Gotteschalk and the disputes on predestination, indicate what advance the young and fresh civilization of the lately barbarian Franks was making. The same age saw the conversion of Bulgaria and the Slave races effected by the Eastern Church, and of the northern tribes of Scandinavia by the Latin.

How wonderful is the vitality exhibited by the Church, when on a general view of the history it appears to be utterly corrupt. The reason, doubtless, is, that while among the evil are the good—to use S. Augustine's metaphor—as the few grains of corn, scattered and lost sight of in the heaps of chaff, those few are living and influential. They show no sign of life when cursorily regarded; but they have that in them which, cast into the ground, swells, shoots up, and bears fruit an hundredfold. Nay more, when one looks at the Church of that period, and beholds it in its manifold corruptions, both in East and West, yet sending out fresh branches, it seems like some aged oak of which the trunk is hollow and decayed, and ready to die, whilst yet it retains in its frame the power of putting forth some new shoots; and to one who lived then and saw no further, it might seem as if this were all—as if these new conversions were the last efforts of expiring life—the flashings of the lamp just going out. An unbeliever in the promises and real hidden life of the Church would have said so then; but, unlike the tree, the Church had within it the power of revival and inward renewal, so that the parts which seemed decayed and ready to perish grew young again.

The history of this revival of religion throughout the Church, to which we refer, is, we think, inadequately drawn out in Dean Milman's history. We mean that vigorous and earnest working of living personal religion, which manifested itself ultimately in the Hildebrandine period and in the age of Bernard. To speak of this as a reformation only would most inadequately express its true nature. A reformation suggests the idea of outward changes—of discipline enforced, and abuses removed. The great feature of the work we speak of is, that the reformation was the result of renewed religion—whilst it was the enforcement of a discipline which persons now would regard as an intolerable burden. That it was the elevation of the ecclesiastical over the secular power is true; but if we look at the real state of Christendom, and the evils produced by the secularizing of the clergy, their subjection to a rude and

savage feudalism—and the gradual reduction by that feudalism of the spiritual offices into the condition of lay and family fiefs—the reforms we speak of appear the only possible remedy. To us the domestic life of a married clergy is one of the fairest pictures of Christian grace. In the eleventh century a priest who married was acting against the rule of the Church, and knowingly doing wrong; and secularity was the result. Such, too, was the power of disposing of the benefices of the Church by the lay powers, and the universal spread of simony. It was a corruption in the Church under which it seemed to be sinking. And the first efforts for reform were made by the Emperors themselves, and it was by the extreme exercise of their power that a series of popes were appointed who carried out that reform—only carrying it out ultimately against the Emperors themselves.

But these great outward changes were the fruit of a revival of personal religion. And one individual was the great original instrument of it, Odo of Clugny. In that house there was set up a standard of Christian life, which spread through the monasteries, and, from the monasteries, through the people of western Christendom. He who holds up a model of religious earnestness in life and conversation—be it even deformed by peculiarities, or sullied by errors—appeals to a responsive principle in the hearts of men, which never fails to answer when the right chord is touched. Berno and Odo of Clugny exhibited a reformed monastery: they did, and they awakened others to do, that which they felt to be their duty—to sacrifice this world to another, and to adopt a strict rule of life and conversation for that end. And the infection spread. One of these great monastic revivals is no light matter. It is not such a very easy or pleasant thing for men to devote themselves to silence, and seclusion, and severity. When they have long been 'settled on their lees'—living in ease and self-indulgence—expending in luxury the property bequeathed for pious uses, under the sanction which bodies corporate feel they have from established practice,—it is no easy matter to bring a whole body—say, of a college,—to adopt a strict and severe life. Yet Odo and his disciples effected this. Clugny did not, like Citeaux in the next age, send out colonies to plant new religious societies. It held out a model according to which other existing societies reformed themselves. Now, it is plain, from the men we see produced by it, and from the very fact that such a system was so adopted, that the ground of it was earnest personal religion. And where that exists it propagates itself. He who cares for his own soul, cares for those of others. The reform of Clugny awakened an earnest spirit, then, throughout

the Church; and this spirit forced reform on unwilling rulers, and forced rulers of its own temper and schooling into places of power. The rule of Clugny was followed by numerous monasteries; and many thousand persons had been trained in Clugny itself; for religious men were attracted thither, and learnt the ways of Clugny by living in it. The Carthusian order sprung up, and contemporaneous reforms took place at Camaldoli and Vallombrosa, in Italy, and at Hirsauge in Germany.

The common impression entertained of Hildebrand is, that he not only maintained certain excessive and overbearing views of ecclesiastical authority, but loved to possess that power and to exercise it himself, and that he succeeded. The fact is, that for twenty years before he became Pope, he was a most active and influential labourer in the cause of reform. But he did not seek office. Others, devoted to the reform of the Church, and latterly, those of his own school, occupied the Papal Chair: his spirit guided their government. He was himself Pope for twelve years. For the first two years he was outwardly successful. The Emperor submitted to his authority and his censure. From that time till his death he was fighting, as it seemed, at a disadvantage. He was, as it appeared, playing a losing game, and carrying on a hopeless struggle. He was hated by very many of his own people:—

‘It was not indeed in Germany or Lombardy alone that the opposition to one or both the Hildebrandine decrees against lay investiture and the marriage of the clergy encountered fierce opposition. The latter, as of more immediate operation, excited the most furious passion. It was about this time that the Archbishop of Rouen, venturing to read the decree in his cathedral, was driven from the pulpit with a shower of stones. At the Council of Paris, when the decree was read, there was a loud outcry of appeal to S. Paul’s Epistle to Timothy. The Abbot of Pont-Isère dared to say that the Pope’s commands, just or unjust, must be obeyed. He was dragged out of the assembly, spat upon, struck in the face by the King’s servants, hardly rescued alive. Everywhere, in Italy, in Rome itself, in France, throughout Germany, the decrees were received with the most vigorous or stubborn oppugnance; Gregory acknowledges the reluctance with which it was submitted to by the great mass of the clergy, the tardiness of the bishops to enforce its penalties. This, doubtless, more than the strife with the empire, the collision between the Italian and German party, was the chief source of the deep and wide-spread rancour excited in the hearts of men, rancour almost unprecedented, against Gregory VII. Later history shows Hildebrand, if not an object of admiration, of awe. Those who most deprecate his audacious ambition, his assumption of something bordering on divinity, respect the force and dignity of his character. The man who by the mere power of mind, by spiritual censures, without an army, except that which he levied by his influence over others, with enemies in his own city, aspired to rule the world, to depose the mightiest sovereigns, to raise up a barrier against the dominion of mere brute force and feudal tyranny, is contemplated, if by some with

enthusiastic veneration, by others if with aversion, as the Incarnation of anti-Christian spiritual pride, nevertheless not without the homage of their wonder, and wonder not unmingled with respect. But in his own day the hostility against his name did not confine itself to indignant and vehement invectives against his overweening ambition, severity, and imperiousness; there is no epithet of scorn or debasement, no imaginable charge of venality, rapacity, cruelty, or even licentiousness, which is not heaped upon him, and that even by bishops of the opposite party.'—Vol. iii. pp. 143, 144.

'He was not safe in Rome.' He was 'in the act of administering the Holy Communion' on Christmas Eve, when he was attacked, struck down, dragged away, imprisoned, but was again rescued by the indignant populace. Wars in Germany, wars in Italy—all seeming to be caused by his obstinacy. The Emperor was at last deposed.

'The triumph of sacerdotal Christianity, in the humiliation of the temporal power, was complete, but it was premature. Hildebrand, like other conquerors, must leave the fruits of his victory to later times. He had established in the face of Europe the great principle, the Papal power of judging kings. Henry himself seemed at first stunned by the suddenness, the force of the blow; Christendom had in like manner been taken by surprise. But the pause of awe and reverence was but brief and transitory; a strong recoil was inevitable; the elements of resistance were powerful, and widely spread. The common hatred of Hildebrand brought together again all who, from lower or from loftier motives, abhorred his tyranny: the Germans, who resented the debasement of the Empire; the Italians, who dreaded the ascendancy of the house of Tuscany; the clergy, who, more or less conscientiously, were averse to the monastic rigour of Hildebrand—those who had felt or who dreaded his censures.'—Vol. iii. p. 173.

Thus there was a great reaction, and the Pope himself was in turn deposed. The majority of the Bishops of Germany were opposed to him; and in Italy he had scarcely any Bishops to support him. Yet he stood firm to the principles he maintained. He was as firm under adversity as in success. For three years Rome was besieged. His own people grew weary of the struggle. He was virtually a prisoner, besieged in the castle of S. Angelo, and the Easter services were celebrated by a rival Pope. The Normans, indeed, recovered the city from the Emperor, but Gregory himself retired and died in exile. He did and suffered all this in maintaining a principle. But he did not enjoy the power which that principle implied. He died; and to all appearance the cause for which he laboured had failed. But he laboured for a principle which survived and prevailed, and others entered into his labours.

Now this could not have been, if there had not been in the Church a strong and decided spirit of sympathy with the cause of Gregory. It was not in the Bishops, or the beneficed clergy. They disliked reform. It was in the revived earnestness of the monastic orders, and of those who were influenced by them. It was the struggle of the few against

the many; but of the few earnest, decided, resolute men who had a principle, which, as they viewed it at least, was based on a religious ground, and commanded the sympathy of religious men. Now, it is this under-current of religious fervour to which we conceive the historian before us does not do justice. The result, when one reads the history is, that we see a great effect without an adequate cause. All the plottings—the setting one party against another—the calling in the Normans—will not account for it. We seem to be amid strange events which we cannot explain—a very unsatisfactory feeling in reading history. In the general spread of a religious spirit, which saw the unchristian corruptions which prevailed, and, wrongly or rightly, regarded the reforms pressed by the Popes as the remedy for them, together with that general temper of the age which respected the spiritual authority exercised by the Church, and openly or secretly quailed before excommunication, we must discern the cause of the ultimate success of the reformers. The first of these causes, at least, has not been brought out as fully as it ought to have been. There is a sketch of some of the causes which influenced these events, *e.g.* the general revival of intelligence and wonderful awakening of the human mind which was going on throughout Christendom; but it is placed later, to introduce the subject of S. Bernard's victory over Abelard. A full treatment of the subject would have afforded room for the genius of the historian, and have made the study of these events much more satisfactory.

The latter part of the fifth book exhibits the Roman See in its deepest degradation. But it was during this period that the seed was being sown which produced such wonderful effects. The period during which the reform of the Church of which we have been speaking was proceeding, occupies the sixth division of Dean Milman's history, in which the German Popes—the reformers antecedent to Hildebrand, and with and under whom he laboured—are treated of, and the former part of the seventh book, which contains the narrative of his own Pontificate. The rest of that book exhibits the effects of his work, from the year of despair in which the small, and, as it seemed, shattered party who were guided by him, elected as Pope the reluctant Abbot whom he had named as his successor, through the Pontificate of Urban II., around whom all Europe rallied in the first crusade. At that point the power and influence of the Pope seemed to bear all before him.

VII. The next book, however, introduces us to the history of Paschal II. and the concordat ultimately arrived at between the Church and the Empire. We then enter on one of the more beautiful and interesting portions of the work—the times of

S. Bernard,—the histories of ‘the Saint, the Philosopher, and the Demagogue of the century,’—the Abbot of Citeaux himself, Abelard, and Arnold of Brescia. It is impossible to follow the author through the details of this history, in which events crowd on each other, and the most vigorous and noble characters are engaged. The following passage will be read with interest:—

‘For half this century the Pope ceases to be the centre around whom gather the great events of Christian history, from whose heart or from whose mind flow forth the impulses which animate and guide Latin Christendom, towards whom converge the religious thoughts of men. Bernard of Clairvaux, now rising to the height of his power and influence, is at once the leading and the governing head of Christendom. He rules alike the monastic world, in all the multiplying and more severe convents which were springing up in every part of Europe, the councils of temporal sovereigns, and the intellectual developments of the age. He is peopling all these convents with thousands of ardent votaries of every rank and order; he heals the schism in the Papacy; he preaches a new crusade, in which a King and an Emperor lead the armies of the Cross; he is believed by an admiring age to have confuted Abelard himself, and to have repressed the more dangerous doctrines of Arnold of Brescia. His almost worshipping admirers adorn his life with countless miracles; posterity must admit the almost miraculous power with which he was endowed of guiding the minds of men in passive obedience. The happy congeniality of his character, opinions, eloquence, piety, with all the stronger sentiments and passions of the time, will account in great part for his ascendancy; but the man must have been blessed with an amazing native power and greatness, which alone could raise him so high above a world actuated by the same influences.

‘Bernard did not originate this new outburst of monasticism, which had already made great progress in Germany, and was growing to its height in parts of France. He was a dutiful son rather than one of the parents of that great Cistercian order, which was now commencing its career in all its more attractive seclusion from the world, and its more than primitive austerity of discipline; which in a short time became famous, and through its fame covered France, parts of England, and some other countries, with new monasteries under a more rigorous rule, and compelled some of the old institutions to submit to a harsher discipline. These foundations, after emulating or surpassing the ancient Benedictine brotherhoods in austerity, poverty, obedience, and solitude, grew to equal and surpass them in splendour, wealth, and independent power.

‘It was this wonderful attribute of the monastic system to renew its youth, which was the life of mediæval Christianity; it was ever reverting of itself to the first principles of its constitution. It seized alike on all the various nations which now formed Latin Christendom; the Northern as the Southern, the German as the Italian. In this adventurous age there must be room and scope for every kind of religious adventure. The untameable independence and individuality of the Teutonic character, now dominant throughout Germany, France, and England, still displays itself, notwithstanding the complicated system of feudal tenures and their bondage, in the perpetual insubordination of the nobles to the sovereign, in private wars, in feats of hardihood and enterprise, bordering constantly on the acts of the robber, the freebooter, and the pirate. It had been at once fostered by, and found vent in the Crusades, which called on every one to become a warrior on his own account, and enrolled him not as a

conscript, or even as a feudal retainer, but as a free and voluntary soldier of the Cross, seeking glory or plunder for himself, or working out his own salvation by deeds of valour against the Unbelievers.

‘It was the same within the more immediate sphere of religion. When that yearning for independence, that self-isolating individuality was found in connexion with the strong and profound passion for devotion, there was nothing in the ordinary and established forms to satisfy the aspirations of this inordinate piety. Notwithstanding, or rather because of the completely organized system of Church government throughout the West, which gave to every province its metropolitan, to every city its bishop, to every parish its priest, there could not but be a perpetual insurrection, as it were, of men ambitious of something higher, more peculiar, more extraordinary, more their own. The stated and uniform service of the Church, the common instruction, must be suited to the ordinary level of faith and knowledge. They knew no change, no progress, no accommodation to more earnest or craving spirits. The almost universal secularisation of the clergy would increase this holy dissatisfaction. Even the Pope had become a temporal sovereign, the metropolitan a prince, the bishop a baron, the priest perhaps the chaplain to a marauding army. At all events the ceremonial of the Church went on in but stately uniformity; the most religious man was but a member of the same Christian flock; there was little emulation or distinction. But all this time monastic Christianity was in the theory of the Church the only real Christian perfection; the one sublime, almost the one safe course, the total abnegation of the monk, renunciation of the world, solitude, asceticism, stern mortification. Man could not inflict upon himself too much humiliation and misery; the true Christian life was one long unbroken penance. Holiness was measured by suffering; the more remote from man the nearer to God; all human sympathies, all social feelings, all ties of kindred, all affections were to be torn up by the roots from the groaning spirit; pain and prayer, prayer and pain, were to be the sole, stirring, unwearying occupations of a saintly life.

‘All these more aspiring and restless and insatiable spirits the monasteries invited within their hallowed walls; to all these they promised peace. But they could rarely fulfil their promise; even they could not satisfy the yearnings for religious adventure. Most of the old monasteries which held the rule either of S. Benedict or of Cassian had become wealthy, and suffered the usual effects of wealth. Some had altogether relaxed their discipline, had long renounced poverty; and the constant dissensions, the appeals to the bishop, to the metropolitan, or where, as they all strove to do, they had obtained exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, to the Pope, showed how entirely the other great vow, obedience to the abbot or prior, had become obsolete. The best were regular and tranquil; they had achieved their labours, they had fertilised their immediate territory, and as though they had now but to enjoy the fruits of their toil, they sunk to indolent repose. Even where the discipline was still severe, it was monotonous, to some extent absolute; its sanctity was exacted, habitual, unawakening. All old establishments are impatient of innovation; a higher flight of devotion becomes insubordination, or a tacit reproach on the ordinary course. Monasticism had been and was ever tracing the same cycle. Now the wilderness, the utter solitude, the utmost poverty, the contest with the stubborn forest and unwholesome morass, the most exalted piety, the devotion which had not hours enough during the day and night for its exercise, the rule which could not be enforced too strictly, the strongly competing asceticism, the inventive self-discipline, the inexhaustible, emulous ingenuity of self-torture, the boastful servility of

obedience: then the fame for piety, the lavish offerings of the faithful, the grants of the repentant lord, the endowments of the remorseful king—the opulence, the power, the magnificence. The wattled hut, the rock-hewn hermitage, is now the stately cloister; the lowly church of wood the lofty and gorgeous abbey; the wild forest or heath the pleasant and umbrageous grove; the marsh a domain of intermingling meadow and corn-fields; the brawling stream or mountain torrent a succession of quiet tanks or pools fattening innumerable fish. The superior, once a man bowed to the earth with humility, care-worn, pale, emaciated, with a coarse habit bound with a cord, with naked feet, is become an abbot on his curvetting palfrey, in rich attire, with his silver cross borne before him, travelling to take his place amid the lordliest of the realm.

‘New orders therefore and new institutions were ever growing out of the old, and hosts of youthful zealots were ripe and eager for their more extreme demands of self-sacrifice, and that which appeared to be self-abandonment, but in fact was often a loftier form of self-adoration. Already, centuries past, in the Benedictine abbeys, the second Benedict (of Aniane) had commenced a new æra of discipline, mortification, saintliness, according to the monastic notion of saintship. But that æra, like the old one, had gradually passed away. Again, in the preceding century, Clugny had displayed this marvellous inward force, this reconstructing, reorganizing, reanimating energy of monasticism. It had furnished the line of German pontiffs to the papacy, it had trained Hildebrand for the papal throne and placed him upon it. But Clugny was now undergoing the inevitable fate of degeneracy: it was said that the Abbot Pontius had utterly forgotten the stern inflexibility of his great predecessor S. Hugh: he had become worldly, and as worldly weak in discipline.’—Vol. iii. pp. 327—331.

We have not space to extract more from these volumes, or to dwell on any other points in them. We pass to some thoughts which are suggested by the general impression which the perusal of them produces.

When one reviews the whole history of Christianity—when one calls to mind the wickedness which has prevailed in the Church, the craft, the falsehood, the violence which have attended its course, nay, have been made instrumental in carrying out its ends—when one sees the deep corruption of the clergy and people (such as that contemporary writers regarded it as the cause of the judgments of God in the irruptions of the northern tribes and the scourge of the Saracens), the prostitution of the most sacred offices, the worldly motives, nay, even the violence that prevailed in the determination of the doctrines of the Church, the continued contentions, (so that that empire which was prophesied of as ‘peace,’ the kingdom of heaven, which ‘is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,’ seemed to be carried on by the worst arts of the worst kingdom of the world)—whilst yet the signs of life that appear in it conspire with the promises on which faith relies to assure us that this is a divine work—that the Spirit of God is, through this institution, teaching, training, sanctifying the elect of God—that it is the Church of Christ—when we realize these

facts, so strangely opposed to each other, we are overpowered by the sense of the mysteriousness and apparent contradictions which are manifested therein. The questions which naturally present themselves are these: Is this state of things compatible with the idea of the Church as revealed in holy Scripture? What did the Divine Founder of the Church lead us to expect? and how far is the truly divine character of the work of the Spirit in the Church compatible with this, its corrupt condition?

Now there is one portion of Scripture that seems specially designed to instruct us herein, where our Lord teaches us respecting 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven:'—'Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,' was His reply to the disciples, when they inquired why He taught in parables. The truths conveyed by those parables, which, veiled in symbolic language, were hidden from the multitude, but by Himself made known to the disciples, are, then, the mysteries of that kingdom, and the exposition of the parables explains the meaning of this expression, at the same time that it tells us what those mysteries are. They are the *mysteries of the kingdom of heaven*; not mysteries respecting the Divine Nature, or the Incarnation of the Son, or sacramental influence, but mysteries connected with that kingdom or empire which was to rise up, and spread, and outgrow the empires that had preceded it, and which was to continue for ever;—of Christianity, that is, considered, not as a body of doctrines and precepts, not as a philosophy or a moral system, nor yet as a dispensation for the salvation of man, when viewed in its internal characteristics and relations, but as externally manifested in the world, as a visible system, relating to men, influencing and ruling mankind as a kingdom or empire, rising up, propagating and extending itself, maintained in and through human agencies; having a visible and assignable extent, gaining ground and losing ground, prospering and sinking, united or divided, with successes and reverses like any other empire. This is the kingdom of heaven, grounded indeed in the hearts and souls of men, having its roots and its most real existence and power there, for 'the kingdom of God is within you,' and being in its true character, a kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost—but externally manifested as if it were of this world, as well as in this world. And this kingdom has its mysteries. There are mysteries connected with it and involved in its very being and conditions; difficulties, inconsistencies, and contradictions apparently irreconcilable, what we should call beforehand impossibilities. That this is the meaning of the word 'mysteries' in this place—and not as some would have it, truths hidden before and now made plain—is evident from the

very truths themselves that were conveyed by the parables, and made known by our Lord to His disciples. For, in fact, these truths are the greatest mysteries, and necessarily involve such contradictions. We are so accustomed from our very childhood to say that the parable, for instance, of the Sower, represents the different ways in which the Gospel is received by different minds, that we lose sight of the mysterious fact that the Gospel, which is thus differently received, is a divine dispensation instituted for the salvation of mankind, and that the parable teaches that in the great majority of instances this institution does not fulfil its end: when the parable teaches us that the gospel is thus differently received, it teaches us that men counteract and render ineffectual the gracious designs of God for their salvation—that moral and spiritual truths do not make way or retain an influence over their hearts, and that the dispensation, in a general view, is, to a great extent, a failure;—that is, that the Almighty and Allwise would have all men to be saved, and institutes means for their salvation, and they are not saved. We cannot wonder that any theories, however strange, have been devised to account for this great mystery, whether the obstinacy of the matter on which the Divine Being had to work, or the counteracting influence of a coequal principle of evil, or His own predestination of evil and perdition.

Strange as it must have seemed to the Apostles, that the kingdom which the God of Heaven would set up, the hope of their people, of which very glorious things had been spoken by the prophets, should thus prove to a great extent a failure; surely it is not less strange to us that an interposition of God—the contrivance of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power—should, as respects the great majority of those whom it was designed to bless, prove to all appearance wholly unsuccessful; that there should be many wholly unbenefited, many making a fair promise, and for some time and in some degree seeming to be really influenced by His grace, yet ultimately without profit from it. It is an instance, of that 'great waste' which there seems to be in nature; many seeds sown and few plants springing up, much blossom and little fruit. Butler notices this fact of nature as analogous to what we see in the moral world; and the spiritual, the Christian world, seems to be ruled on the same law.

Again, to instance another truth conveyed in parable, that in the kingdom of heaven, thus set up on earth, evil should exist, nay, should prevail and be allowed to continue unremoved; that not only should Christianity fail to influence men ultimately for their good, but that even within its domain, and under the profession of its name, and mixed up with and almost undistinguish-

able from true Christians, evil men should continue and should be allowed to continue even to the end,—what is this but that which the same philosopher calls ‘*the great mystery*,’ ‘the continuance of evil and confusion in the world,’ which, whatever anticipation might have been formed of it—from the knowledge of the Divine attributes, or from the language of prophecy—continues even under and within the Gospel system. That system is no exception to the general principle of the Divine government which permits the continuance and the power of evil.

Another mystery is the influence and extension of this kingdom, secret and unaccountable as it is; in its inner workings leavening the whole mass of human society, spreading by a secret but powerful contagion through that mass, making it heave and swell, modifying its condition internally and assimilating it to itself; in its external manifestation being as a great tree spreading over the whole earth, from the smallest beginnings, by means, to human eye, inadequate to the end.

Another mysterious truth most apposite to our present purpose, is that which is revealed in a parable that represents so vividly some manners of ancient time, how God leaves the gospel kingdom to make its way by itself, under the operation of the ordinary laws of human life and being. ‘So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep and rise, night and day,—that is, go on in his ordinary course without attending to that seed or its growth,—and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of itself, *αὐτομάτη*, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come.’

He interposes at the beginning and at the end. The Son of God comes on the earth, does His personal work in the introduction and planting of His Church, and then returns to Heaven, leaving it as it were to take its chance, as though He were indifferent to it, and knew not how it grew or made its way—

γῆτης ὅπως ἄρουραν ἔκτεπον λαβών,
σπείρων μόνον προσείδε κάλαμῶν ἀπαξ·

leaving it to itself, to shoot up, grow, and develop into blade and ear according to the ordinary established laws of nature, till He come again in His own person at the end of the world to reap the harvest.

The Gospel is thus, so to say, left to itself—understanding by the Gospel, the system of Christian truth and corresponding spiritual influence and the external institutions established for

the communication of that influence, and for the extension and preservation of the system. It was sown by our blessed Redeemer in the soil of the human mind, to draw and transmute into its own substance what was contained there, to grow and spread by what it so drew up and transmuted—and this according to the general laws of human nature and the special laws of its own being—nourished by the same gentle rain from Heaven, and the same influences of earth, as the noxious weed, or the noble yet fruitless trees that grow wildly there. The Gospel and the Church influence and are influenced by the world in which they are, according to the general laws by which the world is governed.

These are some of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, some of the facts brought out in the history of Christianity considered as a visible system, as an external institution existing in the world. Its secret influence, its wide extension, and yet, in the case of numberless individuals, and it may be of whole portions of what once was its own domain, its entire failure;—its coming to nothing, and being as if it had never been;—the presence and continuance of evil men within it; of those who are ‘offences,’—who are arguments with others for rejecting Christianity—and ‘those that do iniquity;’ and, lastly, its propagation, and growth, and continued life being seemingly the effect of the general laws of nature, without any apparent interposition on the part of Him who originated it—these things are mysteries, and full of difficulty. Minds there are without number that take things as they are and acquiesce in them,—some from simple faith, some from profound humility, some from a just conviction of the ignorance of man, the result of having searched out all things, and found this as the one lesson taught by all things,—but (in most instances it is to be feared), not from any profound confidence in the goodness and wisdom of God, but in a kind of inconsiderate indifference. These may see no difficulty, but when one comes really to consider these things truly, the questions that open on us are innumerable. We come to know and feel that the history of Christianity is replete with mysteries.

The reason of this we will refer to presently. Let us now observe that the fact is fully contemplated by the first promulgators of the religion. Let the evils, the scandals, the inconsistencies which the history of the Church brings in appalling distinctness before our minds, be set at the highest; the Eye which at its first introduction surveyed the course of that religion and its fruits on earth foresaw these things. The parables predicted them; prophecies, warnings, numberless anticipations distinctly taught them. The history of Christianity and the

predictions of its sacred books entirely harmonise. Be that history ever so unlike what we should have anticipated, it is not unlike what the first promulgators of it said it would be.

Take the most appalling fact of all. According to the received views of Catholic Christians—of Christians we may say of all ages—respecting the established order of the Christian ministry, whether the Episcopate or the Papacy, the difficulty which presents itself is this:—That Christ should have instituted an order of men for the highest and holiest work, to be the guides, and teachers, and the shepherds of His people; to teach, rebuke, reprove,—nay more, to be the appointed channel through which His sacramental gifts should flow to the souls of His people; to have power to open and to close the kingdom of heaven; to remit and to retain sins; to convey the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit—and that this order of men should at any time become utterly corrupt; that individuals on whom the holiness of the Church might seem to turn should be more debased in wickedness than heathen men—should be murderers, adulterers, deceivers; and that this corruption should extend widely and continue long, whereby they who ought to guide others to good should become their corruptors—this is what was not only predicted in various forms, but distinctly intimated by our blessed Lord Himself in words of warning given to that very Apostle who specially represents the Christian ministry, and in whom his successors are inheritors of the warning as of the privileges. The following words in S. Luke (xii. 41) are evidently said with special reference to the Christian ministry in contradistinction to the people generally:—

‘Then Peter said unto Him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all? And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord shall make ruler over His household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when He cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that He will make him ruler over all that He hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, My Lord delayeth His coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for Him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.’—S. Luke xii. 41—46.

These words speak of a steward, one appointed as a ruler over his brother servants to tend, govern, and feed them, to give them their portion of meat in due season; and he becomes corrupt and unworthy of his high office. He possesses power—spiritual power—he abuses it to the purposes of tyranny and of persecution; he takes advantage of his independence to indulge in luxury and sensuality, participating in the vices of the most

corrupt, and wronging, scandalising and ill-treating those over whom he was appointed for good. Yet does he not thereby lose that authority or that office; he is the ruler over the household still; there is no intervention to deprive him, no sudden destruction to remove him. The complaining household may desire their Lord's interposition, they even may cry out, 'Lord, how long?' and yet He does not interpose. This condition of things is contemplated as continuing, the rulers being, as it may happen, good or evil, till the second coming of Christ. The office of the Christian minister abides independently of his abuse of it; it is not incompatible with such abuse; so that the appointed guide and ruler may be worse than any of his flock; all this Christ foresaw, and contemplated, and premonished us of as a possible event. The direct predictions of our Lord state the same truth explicitly. Those of the Apostles agree with them. And the fullest unfolding of the future condition of the Church in the book of the Revelations exhibits one series of pictures of confusion, sin, and evil predominant,—the good few in number and oppressed.

And the cause of these evils is to be found in that special feature of the Christian system, its being carried on through the instrumentality of man, combined with that great principle of the Divine government, whereby the free will of man remains unconstrained. God might, so far as we know, have carried on the work of the Gospel by the ministry of beings of another order than our own. He might have used the services of angels to be channels of grace to His Church, to teach, to baptize, to consecrate, to absolve, to support and comfort. This He has not done: Man is made the instrument of good to man. The body of revealed truth was communicated at first through men; committed to writing by men of varying abilities and natural dispositions, it is perpetuated and administered by man,—by men sympathising with men, knowing each other's wants and infirmities, and so working together. The system of truth and supply of grace in the Gospel is committed to the world in connexion with a society drawn out of the world, a society of men, framed like any other society, and having a history like any other society. Hence it is that the Church of Christ may be regarded solely in its human aspect. It may be looked on as if it were only human. It is to this law of the Christian dispensation, according to which Divine purposes are carried out by the instrumentality of moral agents, and to the freedom of those agents that these results are obviously to be attributed. In the instance of the individual Christian, the influence of Divine grace, nay, the presence of the Divine Spirit does not destroy the natural character; it is compatible

with the presence of much that is weak, sinful, imperfect in the understanding as well as the will. This is the condition ever of the holiest of men, and imperfection and occasional wrong conduct is the result. How much more when in the body of men acting together there are persons of every degree of mixed good and evil, and the majority quite evil.

Yet amid all this corruption the truth in its substance has held its place. It is with religion as with moral truth; it commands deference where it cannot gain obedience, and secures the assent of the understanding whilst the will remains rebellious. It lives on, exercises influence, recovers power where it seemed to be almost utterly destroyed.

ART. II.—*The Life of Mrs. Sherwood.* By S. KELLY.
1 vol. London: Darton & Co.

THE sphere of biography extends from day to day. We are so accustomed to see announcements of the lives of persons whose names have scarcely reached us, that it ceases to be a question as it once was, what remarkable things has such an one done, or seen, or thought that, now he has passed away, the world must be made acquainted with his private history. Rather we are arrived at the conclusion that every life is interesting if we can only have its truthful history, and to acquiesce in and even believe ourselves gainers by this communicative habit of our own time. It does not, in fact, require celebrity to make a biography either agreeable or useful; the changes of an ordinary life have enough of variety and romance in them to engage the interest of others in the like position. It only requires that these changes should have made deep impression—that the subject of the memoirs should have lived for a purpose,—and that what has been done, seen or thought, should be vividly portrayed.

In the present abundance of biographies, then, we have no need to ask why the particular one under review has been published. Every person has at least heard of Mrs. Sherwood. Many in their childhood were familiar with her works; not a few, if not of our own readers, yet of readers in general of a certain standing, have received their first notions of doctrinal religion from her fluent and prolific pen. Such being the case we took up the book with both interest and curiosity. However little we might expect to agree with the lady's theology, however little we may have sympathised with her mode of instructing young minds in Christian truth, she had influence in her day, and with a large party; and we naturally wish to know the character, and something of the history of every mind possessed of this mysterious power. But the book disappoints expectation. It is tedious and heavy, so much so, especially at the commencement, that without the stimulus of duty, which ought ever to be paramount in the reviewer's bosom sustaining him through mighty achievements of dull reading, it would be next to impossible to read it honestly through. The cause of this failure presently dawns upon the mind. An autobiography,—which this book is with the exception of a few concluding chapters by her daughter,—should be produced by a clear and accurate memory, assisted by copious notes taken at the time, either in the form of letters to friends, or of a daily record of

events. The reader soon becomes convinced that Mrs. Sherwood's memory was not a vivid one, not enough so at least to assign to each age its distinct recollections; her remembrance of persons is vague, and of the few distinguished names which occur, she remembers little more than the name. She commenced this task, too, late in life, concluding it in her seventy-third year, with many a busy bustling year of married life intervening between this period and the youth she dwells upon with a garrulous prolixity, if not with the desired distinctness. Even in the times when she kept a journal, she finds cause to regret that she made it rather a record of feeling than of fact. But present feeling is at least worth more than retrospective feeling, as being likely to be truer. With a speculative mind of a progressive order, whose pursuit, after its own fashion, is truth; experience tells us nothing is more remorseless than its sacrifices and abandonments of its former self or rather *selves*. Ambition does not kick away the ladder by which it climbed more indifferently than does the enthusiast renounce and repudiate every previous stage of progress. The step he stands on is knowledge and light and peace one day, and gross darkness the next. So, if we are to learn anything by his wanderings we prefer a current history giving the triumphs and exultations of each stage rather than the retrospect of the whole as a series of failures, which gives a fallacious idea of rest at last, of a long search resulting in a final discovery. From Mrs. Sherwood we learn little beyond her latest conclusions, and those but dimly set forth; for whether through her own mystic style or her daughter's caution, we are left to infer her meaning rather than see it anywhere distinctly stated; but we find that she had written many of her most dogmatic works, in which such as are acquainted with her writings will know that her opinions are set forth with all imaginable confidence and assurance, before she had attained to anything like what she considered distinct truth; and now and then curious admissions occur showing the slight value of even the most formal statements of persons of this temper of mind concerning their own religious history, when their theory demands them; as where, describing her spiritual state as of a school girl of sixteen or seventeen, she says:

'Now sincerely I do not believe that the ignorance in which I then lay, of anything relating to real religion, was the fault of my parents; neither do I now believe, what once I not only believed but asserted, that until my mind was partially opened to the truth after my marriage I had actually never heard that truth, either in public or in private. But this I do firmly believe, that I was not capable of receiving the Gospel while in an unregenerate state, for it is only by the enlightening and unerring influences of the Spirit one can receive "the truth as it is in Jesus." From a child I *had* read the word of God, and that word *is* truth; but I had not the moral capacity to receive anything more than an historical view of it.'—Pp. 116, 117.

And there is one even more remarkable notice of the religion of her childhood written in advanced age—as throwing an unreality on all her previous positive statements concerning her alleged unregenerate state up to mature womanhood. It is contradictory of much beside in the book, but thus it stands:—

‘It would not be easy to judge of the character of a child so favourably circumstanced as I was; neither *can I myself decide* whether I had then any ideas of religion beyond what parents may teach,—in fact, beyond what may be acquired by the unregenerate mind: the time of trial was then remote, and the evil nature restrained by the gentle, yet firm, hand of a tender and wise mother.’—P. 39.

Our readers, however, will prefer some facts concerning our authoress than longer dwelling on these curiosities of feeling which are also best developed in the course of the narrative. All people are of such consequence to themselves,—every individual is so absolutely the centre and hero to himself of the scene he moves in that we can never wonder at any undue sense of importance. Indeed the strongest efforts of philosophy are not more than necessary to teach a man to estimate his own position at its due worth. When Mrs. Sherwood, therefore, prefaces her life with the following exordium, we may smile a little at the importance she attaches to the work, and muse upon the shortness of her day, and how little she knew that her influence and fame were both circumscribed within the span of her own life,—but such disparaging thoughts should be corrected by the consideration that if any one was ever encouraged to an over-estimate of self, she was. Indeed the value of such a record as she has left really lies in illustrating the mischief and injury many a gifted nature receives from being tempted to tasks and offices for which, from the very nature of things, it is unfitted:—

‘I am tempted to this most singular undertaking, by an observation I have lately been induced to make upon the propensity of the age for writing and recording the lives of every individual who has had the smallest claim to celebrity. Could I be quite sure, that when I am gone, nobody would say anything about me, I should, I think, spare myself the trouble which I now propose to take; but when I consider that it is possible that dear friends, when mourning for me, may speak too partially of me, or that those who do not understand me may bring forward some of the many errors of my writings to uphold their own opinions, I feel it but justly due to Divine love and mercy to state, how, through a life of many changes, I have been gradually brought to see the truth to a point of view which is luminous indeed, and bright as the day, when compared with the twilight ray that I first discerned. The light of lights, which I now enjoy, is not a deceitful one—an ignis fatuus, or feeble emittance of fire, which can possibly lead me astray; and for this reason, that in the same measure as it burns brighter and brighter I discern more and more of the *all-sufficiency* of God, and of the total insufficiency of man. Thus, to speak in scriptural language, “The city shall have no need of the sun, for the Lamb shall be the light thereof.”...

‘There has been a singular Providence attending me through life, and preparing me in a remarkable manner for that which it was the Divine will I

should do. I say *singular*, more perhaps because I am better acquainted with the steps which have brought *me* thus far in my progress, than with the histories and experiences of other persons. But far be it from me to suppose that anything I ever received was in any way merited by me. All I have received is a free gift; and the remarkable benefits which have been bestowed upon me, and the very high privileges which I have enjoyed, ought rather to excite wonder and gratitude than self-congratulation. Oh! my God, "what is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him!"'—Pp. 1—3.

Mrs. Sherwood was the daughter of the Rev. George Butt, son of a physician at Lichfield, Dr. Carey Butt, described as a man of exemplary piety, integrity and benevolence. She expresses herself with passionate devotion for her father, and uniformly describes him as a model of disinterested benevolence, generous to profusion, and incapable of care in money concerns. A daughter's deep affection is a guarantee for some true excellences of character, for even natural tenderness must have something real to feed on. Yet the facts about her father do not quite consort with these praises. In the course of his life he accumulated a vast amount of Church patronage in the way which public opinion allowed people to do in those days, and he married almost avowedly for money, while still mourning the loss of a lady to whom he had been attached. The circumstances are best detailed in his daughter's words:—

'It was the will of God, however, that this lovely young woman, Mary Woodhouse, should be taken early from this world of trials; and it was whilst still mourning her loss my father consented to his father's earnest wishes to marry my mother, whose fortune rendered her a desirable match under the pecuniary circumstances of the family. Mary Woodhouse was one of three sisters, all of whom were accounted lovely; whilst my mother, then Miss Martha Sherwood, was a very little woman, having a face too long in proportion, with too decided features. She was marked too with the small-pox, and had no personal beauty but in her hands, the like of which I have never seen equalled. She was of a meek and gentle spirit, and it was no doubt oppressive to her to be associated in the house with three of the most lovely women of the time. What, then, must her feelings have been when her father's commands or wishes were made known to her, that she was to marry one who still mourned the untimely fate of the fair Mary! Often have I thought of this since, and been led to consider that the smallest circumstances of human life are, no doubt, arranged in such a way as to advance our everlasting good, though, through the devices of Satan, we love to "kick against the pricks," wilfully misunderstanding the arrangements of Providence. For the Almighty is teaching individuals, by different experiences, the evil consequences of sin, and the effectual and perfect work of the Saviour's sacrifice to reconcile the world to God—a glorious exhibition of Divine love, justice, mercy, and holiness, to be manifested in due time.'—Pp. 14, 15.

These vague but satisfied comments on actions which cannot be approved, as though a special providence directed all which concerned herself, are common in this book, and form one of its noticeable points. It is the attribute of God indeed to bring good out of evil, but this does not make the evil less evil. And

it is *not* one of Satan's devices, but the working of pure, modest natural feeling which leads a young woman to 'kick against,' or as we should say, shrink from a marriage with a man who she knows cannot love her, but marries her from mere prudential considerations.

The marriage (it took place in the year 1773) did not prove an unhappy one as far as we can gather: yet the wife's life was evidently tinctured by this inauspicious commencement. Three children were the fruits of it, a son, the Rev. George Butt, Mary Martha, the subject of the present memoir, born 1775, and Lucy, some years younger, afterwards Mrs. Cameron, well known as sharing her sister's facility in writing. Mrs. Sherwood's style is never more awkward than when drawing the character of her parents—a difficult task to the most accomplished pen. Here we have to wade through a circumlocution of florid expressions intended to convey reverence, affection, devotion and admiration, till the thing she has really to tell lies smothered in so much decoration. We can discern, however, that her father had most of her real regard, that her vigorous nature and cheerful temperament were inherited from him. His genial love of society and success in it prevented the little sadnesses of such a home from affecting him in any way; and very early it is clear that there were more sympathies between the father and his clever daughter, than the husband with his dejected, retiring, unattractive, yet refined wife. The power of expressing affection without reserve or timidity was very likely his, as it was certainly his daughter's; and if we may judge from *her* daughter's part in this narrative, the impulse descends unabated to the third generation. His position also was one for his children to be proud of. He was popular with high and low, courted by men of rank for his social qualities; a court-chaplain, and somewhat eminent as a preacher; with a literary and reading reputation, easily won in those days; and endowed with an expansive easy benevolence of temperament which made him at home with all ranks and all persuasions. When leaving the elegant retirement of their country living, the family removed to the better preferment of Kidderminster; while Mrs. Butt shrank from the impolite associates amongst whom they were thrown, her husband's more vigorous mind moulded society even there to something congenial to his own tastes, talked himself, led the conversation, and gave his own tone to it. He was hand and glove with the dissenting ministers, and encouraged the growing liberalism of that day by such conspicuous acts of fraternisation, as could hardly be enacted now.

'My dear father's benevolent feeling had a wide play at Kidderminster.

'There were at that time, and still I believe are, many dissenters in that

town. Though our family were decided Church people, yet my father manifested as much kindness to the dissenters as to his own peculiar flock. By his entire exemption from bigotry he was as much loved by one party as by the other, and was on fraternal terms with the two dissenting ministers, often inviting them to his house, and discussing religious subjects with them in the most candid manner. He was also accustomed, when there was a charity sermon at either meeting-house, to attend himself in his gown and cassock, and stand at the door as the people went out, setting me before him to hold the plate, his whole countenance on these occasions beaming with love for all his fellow-creatures.—P. 82.

He early established it in his own and his daughter's mind that she was to be a genius and a writer, from which we infer that she must have shown talent early, though no particular indications are given of this beyond the power of inventing and extemporizing long stories to her companions. He taught her Latin, and gave her the run of his library: one of her pleasantest early recollections being connected with a waggon load of books her father had bought at the sale of Walsh's (the friend of Addison) library, for the sum of one guinea. These books, dusty and black, but choice editions many of them of ancient romances and old divinity, it was her privilege to assist her father to arrange, in a loft assigned by her mother for their reception. A delightful task for a book-loving girl, and a tempting guinea's worth. We only wonder that with such opportunities this authoress made no further advance in style and composition than she did. An inherent commonness pervades everything she ever wrote; a total want either of point or elegance, which is hardly reconcilable with the careful, and at the same time original and peculiar education she received. But her mind, made more for action than for thought, though thrust by circumstances into this latter groove, resisted no doubt anything like deep culture.

Such being her father, such in himself, and such towards her, we are not surprised that filial piety should compel her to relax something in the rigid tests by which she usually judges of spirituality of mind, and that though he conformed to the amusements and customs of the world, which throughout her works she regards as the criterion of the soul's condition,—and though there was in his statements of religious truth a total absence of terms and phrases, in all other cases deemed essential by her,—yet she happily reconciles herself to the discrepancies, and concludes her father's character in the following terms. We remember Charlotte Elizabeth in a similar way makes an exception in favour of a favourite brother, and allows him to be saved without conforming to any one of her essential conditions:—

'But in speaking of my beloved father, of his thousand kind acts, of his humility, and of his enlarged love for every human being who came under his eye, I must restrain myself, lest I should so far wander as almost to

forget my object. One remark, however, I must make before I dismiss this subject, and that is, that we might as readily suppose warmth and light to exist in the sun independently of all Divine power, as to attribute the enlarged charity of my father to the motions of an uninfluenced nature. To sum up his character in a few words: he was as pure in heart, as free from what is wrong, as the present imperfect state of human nature will permit.'—P. 83.

Her mother's cares bestowed on her, and they were many, were all of a more austere kind, and certainly raise a picture somewhat forbidding, though she never seems to have failed in maternal duty, and certainly not in real affection. Her system of education was one of restrictions, severities, and denials. Probably from the unhappy circumstances of her marriage, her sympathies were never fully drawn out. She lived much in herself and for a few intimate friends, and does not seem to have been able to inspire intimacy and confidence in her children. Still her daughter, with that singular mixture of real good feeling, and strong conviction that somehow the results in her own case were so good, that the means by which such results were attained must have been the best, while she carefully records all the little hardships of her childhood, assures us she would not have had them otherwise:—

'The society in which I mixed as a child was such as to give a decided turn to the thoughts and the tastes. Indeed, as long as I have lived, I have never heard any persons converse as my father and mother were accustomed to converse. My mother never suffered her children to interrupt conversation. We were compelled to listen, whether willing or not. My father not only conversed in a superior way himself, but he gave the tone to all his visitors and to all his pupils. I can hardly say how young I was when I got ideas of other countries, and other times, and other modes of life, such as, by the modern style of education, could never possibly be obtained; and this through the simple means of listening to my father's conversation. Whilst this system of improvement was always going forward whenever the family were assembled, there was a private discipline of such undeviating strictness carried on with me by my excellent mother, that it might have appeared that no other person in the world could have been better fitted to bring a mere child of many imaginations under control than was my ever honoured parent. Lady Jane Grey speaks of the severities to which she was subjected by her noble parents. I had neither nips, nor bobs, nor pinches; but I experienced what I thought much worse. It was the fashion then for children to wear iron collars round the neck, with a backboard strapped over the shoulders: to one of these I was subjected from my sixth to my thirteenth year. It was put on in the morning, and seldom taken off till late in the evening; and I generally did all my lessons standing in stocks, with this stiff collar round my neck. At the same time I had the plainest possible food, such as dry bread and cold milk. I never sat on a chair in my mother's presence. Yet I was a very happy child; and when relieved from my collar, I not unseldom manifested my delight by starting from our hall door, and taking a run for at least half a mile through the woods which adjoined our pleasure-grounds.'—Pp. 38, 39.

And again, we have the following painful picture of rough discipline :—

‘My sister, as a child, had not good health, and therefore she could bear neither the exposure nor fatigue I did. Hence the reason wherefore I was so much alone. From this cause, too, she was never submitted to the same discipline that I was; she was never made so familiar with the stocks and iron collar, nor the heavy tasks; for after my brother was gone to school, I still was carried on in my Latin studies, and even before I was twelve I was obliged to translate fifty lines of Virgil every morning, standing in these same stocks with the iron collar pressing on my throat. It only wanted one to tell me that I was hardly used to turn this healthful discipline into poison; but there was no such person to give this hint, and hence the suspicion never, as I remember, arose in my mind that other children were not subjected to the same usage as myself. If my sister was not so, I put it down to her being much younger, and thus I was reconciled to the difference made between us.’—P. 54.

Iron collars and stocks have long been exploded as likely paths to the graces. At eleven years old our authoress had opened out to her a more flowery way, by a fine French lady, who paid her parents a visit, decorated in all the preposterous finery of Marie Antionette’s prosperous days. The child always knew she was to be a genius, Madame de Pelevé’s conversation raised the question in her, whether she was also to be a beauty, a point about which she became for the time a good deal more solicitous: indeed we may possibly trace to a visit of curiosity paid to her mirror about this time, for the purpose of ascertaining this point, those many pages devoted to the description of personal beauty which subsequently enliven even her most serious and profound polemical works.

At fifteen she was sent to school at Reading. Her father was on intimate terms with Dr. Valpy, head master of the Grammar School there, and while on his annual visit to his friend was witness of a ‘sort of exhibition,’ probably a theatrical performance, got up by the pupils of Monsieur and Madame St. Q——’s school, kept in the old abbey. He was delighted with all he saw, and pronounced it ‘the very place for Mary,’ in which judgment his daughter believed him to have been ‘divinely directed,’ though the whole conduct of the school was absolutely opposed to her own principles, as it would have been in many respects disapproved by all who desire any kind of religious instruction for their children. Yet it was evidently no common-place boarding-school. M. de St. Q—— possessed the art of teaching. The girls’ minds were developed; they caught a tone from the place and from one another. They learned to converse; met good society of a certain class; saw much of French refugees, who flocked round their old friend, and had their minds turned towards the subjects of the time of most real interest; and, as Mrs. Sherwood insinuates, acquired

a certain grace of manner, which for ever supplanted the awkwardness of overgrown girlhood which had previously oppressed her and called down the reproofs of her friends. That the influence of this school upon young ductile minds was a powerful one, and also that it took a certain definite direction, is evident. The popular authoresses Miss Mitford and L. E. L., and Lady Caroline Lamb, who made some noise in her day, were educated by M. and M^dle. de St. Q——, though not at the same time with Mrs. Sherwood. It is curious to trace the same somewhat French glow of sentiment, the same strain of overwrought, often unreal feeling, and through all the same power of exciting interest, and engaging the sympathies of a large, though perhaps not very discriminating, class of readers, which these well-known female writers evidence through all their manifold differences of style and subject. To the one we are most concerned with, it was a charming scene of liberty and excitement, symbolized the very first morning of arrival by the privileges (forbidden at home) of free approach to the fire, and buttered toast.

No writer of her party has made it more her concern to discountenance and dispute the view of Baptism taught by our Prayer-book. No one has said more on the necessity of being able to pronounce on the precise period of conversion, from which the elect soul may date the moment of regeneration, than Mrs. Sherwood. The utter absence of reserve or timidity in approaching such subjects, the rude jarring positiveness of assertion, the unscrupulous judgment passed upon individuals and classes in respect to them, might at least lead us to expect beforehand that she herself was a signal instance to her own mind of their truth; and so, as we have said, she has somewhere stated it. Yet to us an absolutely contrary state of things is apparent, from her own self-history, of which there is evidently a curious glimmering consciousness in herself. Possibly her latest lights, as she deemed them, made the former view less necessary to her system. Be this as it may, in a certain dim way she is forced to recognise the pleadings of a divine principle in what she holds as the unconverted portion of her life. Take the following anecdote:—

‘I truly believe the larger number of the girls in the highest class at Reading were certainly simple and well-intentioned. Some bad ones there were indeed, and it so happened these were in the room in which I slept. For I had not been at school many weeks, when one night, having gone to bed before the supper in the parlour, which I had the privilege of attending, I was kept from sleeping for some time by a conversation in the next bed, attended by repeated laughs.

‘I knew that something bad was going on, though I did not understand all that was said. I called out, “Have done with that nonsense, or I will

go down and tell of you." "That I am sure you will not," said my neighbour. "I will not," I answered, "if you will let us hear no more of it." There were many other girls in the room, but chiefly little ones. "We will not have done," was the reply I received. After one or two more warnings I got up, dressed myself, and went down into the parlour, where I reported the case. Madame St. Q——, whatever she might have thought or wished, was obliged to take up the affair for the credit of the establishment. The girls were punished by bread-and-water diet for a day or two. Through the Divine favour I never heard another bad word at school, though I not unseldom observed the breaking-off of a discourse between two girls when I came near.

'It might be asked, whether it was under the influence of religion that I did this right action, whereby I protected the ears of all the little people in the room as well as my own? Really, I am unable to answer this question, for I do not think that when at Reading I ever gave much attention to religion; though, through the force perhaps of education, I had a high respect for it, accompanied with a somewhat *delicate* sense of morality.'—Pp. 95, 96.

And again, in the following passage, with its inconclusive reasonings:—

'I had heard my parents speak with horror of certain novels, whose names I will not mention. One evening, in the schoolroom, I picked up an abridgment of one of these old novels. I saw at once that the title was the same as one which I knew my parents condemn. However, the temptation was strong, and I read a page or two. Suddenly, however, a better thought was inspired, and I laid the book down, at the same time, as I believed, unobserved, I lifted up my eyes, saying, "God forgive me for my disobedience." A violent burst of laughter, and a cry from the French teacher to this effect, "Mademoiselle Butt is saying her prayers," suddenly startled me, and I felt more guilty than if I had been detected in stealing, or any other disgraceful act. . . .

'After the two anecdotes I have given of myself, does not the question suggest itself,—Had a change of heart taken place with me then? Was there, or was there not, a new life dwelling within me at that time? Again, I answer, I think not; that is, I have no idea of anything which seemed to be good in me at that time, or anything that was more than the effect of habit and of a careful education. I can recollect no secret working of the Divine Spirit in my heart, convincing me of sin, or rendering me anxious to please my God, above and before all other motives of action. And again, I consider that as the gifts of the Spirit have life in themselves, so they grow and increase under apparently the most unpropitious circumstances, as the results of Divine influence; whilst those respectable qualities which originate in education only, have on the contrary *no* life in themselves, and are therefore subject to perish for ever. Thus at Reading, though improved no doubt in many respects, I gradually lost some of my simpler and childlike habits, and after a little while my Bible never saw the light. I began to think less of what would please my mother than of what would promote my own pleasure.'—Pp. 96—98.

As we have said, there was much in her education to form and develop a character, and there was quite enough in our authoress for these influences to work upon. The freedom and absence of all proper guidance at 'the Abbey' were prepos-

terous enough, but lessons were learnt with spirit, and much was acquired beside that lessons cannot teach. Without however commending either the system itself or its results, the fact of its having possessed influence may still lead us to speculate on the fruits, as far as vigour of character and intellect are concerned, likely to accrue from the modern system of education, with its universal knowledge diffused by the same cut-and-dried means; its perpetual chatter in foreign tongues about nothing at all, which is the substitute for conversation with such as can readily learn the common-places of language; the long silence to which the less fluent are condemned, who find silence easier than to sustain a talk of platitudes with the French, or Italian, or German governess, chosen not for the fulness of her mind, but for the correctness of her accent; the sedulous occupation of every hour on some definite study or lesson in the dreary school-room: the real art of conversation all the while being as little developed by practice, or by listening to anything that deserves the name, as though a girl's native tongue was avowedly the one she is least concerned to speak well. Happily children's minds have a power of resistance, as well as an ever fresh and renovating spring within, and the thoughts have a channel, and a language of their own, unapproachable—one might say safe—from meddling interference, or the levelling, deadening influence of this training would surely destroy all the brightness and originality of its victims, and society would stand a chance of becoming too empty or too dull for its own existence.

But this digression is not intended either to recommend the Abbey's system nor its consequences on the mind of our authoress; we only point it out as an influential developing system, which all education ought to be, leaving recollections not of a mere drudgery of lessons, into which the learner could not enter, but of mind acting upon mind—a point forgotten, as it often seems now, in female education, when the inquiry about a school is not as to the degree of intellectual power of the mistress, or her skill in forming and guiding young minds, but the expensiveness and name of the masters of accomplishments.

The school days we are now upon ended in such a glow of French glitter and gaiety, as make us fully share our authoress's wonder that no harm came of it, or at least no other than the sentimental tincture, which is after all by no means the worst or most injurious point in Mrs. Sherwood's children's books. She describes a play in which she took a subordinate part, acted by the young ladies, as it seems with a kind of publicity, 'for the benefit of the distressed emigrants,' the prologue and apologue written by her father, the whole under the auspices of Dr. Valpy, calling to our minds a vivid description of similar theatrical

performances, recorded somewhere by Miss Mitford, and thus dwells on the concluding days of her school life:—

‘I have many pleasing recollections of those, the few last weeks of our residence at Reading. It was bright summer weather, and whilst the days for our representation approached we lived more and more with the noble emigrants, and entered more and more into their feelings. We talked with the ladies, and danced with the gentlemen under the trees in the Abbey garden to the music of the harp. We were then, as it were, completely carried away with the spirit and feelings of France—of the olden times; and, though nominally at school, were in fact leading what Madame Genlis calls “*La Vie de Château*.” It was not necessary that any of those who were then at the Abbey at Reading should have crossed the channel to have known what France had been under the old régime. We were even then living according to the ancient spirit, and I have often, often marvelled how it was that we, the elder girls of the establishment, were preserved as we were from serious danger, and ever treated with high respect, though too often compared to “roses,” “stars,” and “jewels,” and all that was beautiful and rare in nature. Of course this order of things could not have lasted long, it was too much out of the way of common discretion; but so long as I and my sister remained at the Abbey, no dark cloud rolled over the bright horizon. For years afterwards some particular tunes and airs reminded me of those happy days—days only the more interesting to my young fancy from the peculiar situation at the time of the affairs of France, and especially of the royal family. War had been already declared, and thus was a colour given to the fate of many who seemed least connected with public affairs.

‘I could add much more to my reminiscences of Reading.’—Pp. 118, 119.

She returned home well qualified to take her place in society; and as no one ever had advantages of any sort, however perilous or questionable, without valuing them, we find the following complacent notice:—

‘The last year, and particularly the society I had kept, had made a change in me. I was not the same awkward girl I had been; and this was instantly pronounced by all who saw me. I had been much in high foreign society, and I had gained that something which can only be acquired by high society, and can never be given without frequent intercourse with good company, and perhaps I ought to add with a variety of good company. I was also then at an age when young people improve, if ever they do improve, in these respects.’—Pp. 119, 120.

The year that followed this return commenced and ended with gaieties, and was, she says, ‘almost the first and the last year of any great vanity in her life.’ She was admired, and, we are led to infer, had beauty enough to make some little sensation.

And now she began to fulfil her father’s literary aspirations, and was detected by him in the act of composition. He eagerly seized the papers, and was delighted with this fruit of his own instructions. Eventually he made his daughter publish the novel on which she was engaged, though she had the wisdom to shrink and be averse to the publicity her name thus acquired. But the history of a first work should be told in the author’s own words, that the pleasures and pains, never to be forgotten, of so

interesting an occasion may be best apprehended: if the *pains* have undue prominence given to them the little self-delusion may be excused; the more as the memoir contains very little concerning her works or literary successes. There is reason to believe the 'Mr. Smith' of the narrative to be her quondam tutor, Mr. St. Q—.

'In the meantime I went on with "The Traditions," my father encouraging me, and everybody about me leading me to think myself most highly gifted by nature; and yet let it not be supposed that it was in the article of intellect that my vanity was most easily excited. But how shall I state the case, as I conceive it to have really been? Can I possibly do it? Can any one judge of the real state of his own feelings? I will try, however, as far as I can, to explain mine. My father had impressed upon me in very early years that I was to turn out what he called a genius; and, therefore, the idea was so familiar to me, and the conviction that it was so, was a fact so strongly engraven upon my mind, that it never came upon me by surprise.

'It was a matter of course to me that I was to write, and also a matter of instinct. My head was always busy in inventions, and it was a delight to me to write down these inventions. Fortunately, however, from circumstances, and especially from reading the papers in the "Tatler" respecting Miss Jenny Bickerstaff, I had a horror of being thought a literary lady; for it was, I fancied, ungraceful, unlike a heroine, and, in short, I did not at all desire to be known as an authoress. I was far less established in the idea of my own good looks than of my talents, and one word in favour of the latter was far more precious than thousands in praise of the former. I cannot but think now, that if my dear father did not entirely deceive himself as to my powers of imagination, he certainly formed a very false estimate respecting them; for the only work of mine he ever saw finished was "The Traditions," and assuredly that work, when completed for the press, exhibited a mind very, very far from maturity. These volumes were hardly finished, as to their first rough outline, when letters came announcing the total ruin of a dear friend—an event which had for some time been expected. Even now, though years are past, I do not desire to publish the name; suffice it, my readers have seen it mentioned in this diary, and they are very dull of comprehension if they cannot trace it out. But Mr. Smith, as I shall now call him, was in much need of money, and my beloved father proposed that my manuscript should be published by subscription for his benefit. My heart sunk at the proposition; to be thus forced into public before I was of age, to be set down so soon in that character which I had always dreaded—as a Miss Jenny Bickerstaff. I was very unhappy; but then, again, to disappoint my father in his benevolent scheme, and to withhold a helping hand from the friend I so dearly loved, was impossible. I could not, and I did not, utter a denial; but really and truly I was thoroughly vexed. Many, many tears I shed in private.—Pp. 124, 125.

For some reason Mr. Butt determined to return to his beautiful country living at Stanfield, leaving a curate at Kidderminster. This was rather a dull change for his daughters, used to so much society, the more as their mother's peculiarities, strengthened by indulgence, were evidently inimical to cheerfulness:—

'My sister and myself began now in a small degree to apprehend the effects of solitude on our mother. She liked to shut herself up from company, sitting much in her dressing-room, requiring us to amuse her. We

procured books and read a great deal, and got over every part of the twenty-four hours very well, with the exception of an hour or two at dusk. My dear mother loved this hour, and always put off having lights, and she had an objection to our sitting round near the fire, and in short she made those hours very sad, and, I must honestly say, disagreeable to us. Between dinner and tea, at tea and after tea, we again did very well, because she loved to hear us read aloud; but she always hurried us to bed, and when alone with her we never experienced anything of that little interval of cheerful conversation and freedom from restraint which in most families precedes the moment of separation and retirement for the night. Any stranger coming in would take away something of the weight of this restraint, and therefore the presence of my uncle or Dr. Salt was a benefit which we hardly could prize too highly. As to my father, he certainly was often induced to go from home to get away from this restraint; and yet our gentle and kind mother was, I am convinced, to her very last moment utterly unconscious of doing anything which could make anybody about her uncomfortable.'—P. 133.

These duller home scenes were, however, interspersed by different excitements, the commencement of another novel, a season at Bath and other matters. But now a more serious period of her life had arrived. In 1795 she lost her father, who was struck with palsy while he must yet have been almost in the prime of life, and died after a short illness, which was accompanied by all the painful circumstances of gradually clouding intellect which characterise that disorder. His loss was not only a severe one in itself, but was the commencement of a less cheerful plan of life, for Mrs. Butt, seized with the fear of poverty, and unused to act for herself, began a course of retrenchments congenial to no age, and especially chilling to youth. For a while her eldest daughter resisted this influence by indulging herself in visits at Bath, in London, and elsewhere; but soon in a better spirit she settled down with her mother and sister in the dark and dismal house at Bridgenorth, where the former had chosen their residence. After recording some passages from her mother's journal on occasion of arriving at this unattractive home, she adds the following singular comment on her own oblivion of the feelings of the period; what must unretentive memories think of their spiritual state if such a theory can be proved:—

'I have little or no recollection of what I myself thought, or felt, or said, or did at that time. And is it so, that the vain thoughts of the unregenerate child of Adam pass away from the memory and utterly perish, like the dreams of the night, which fly before the morning, and that the individual only begins really to live when the new and Divine nature is imparted? But it certainly has struck me with force, that in the early parts of my youth, where I have no journal to direct me, though I can recal many, many facts, I cannot remember much of anything of what I thought or how I felt on such and such occasions.'—P. 161.

Though her present life at Bridgenorth was dull and uncongenial, she was not of a nature to be unhappy anywhere, and here was opened to her the first of those practical means of use-

fulness to others, beyond her home circle, for which she was so well suited. The curate of their parish suggested to her and to her sister that they should take charge of a Sunday School. They threw themselves into this good work with a great deal of energy, and no doubt with unusual talent, as is shown by the lasting influence for good they obtained over their pupils. Our authoress, looking back on this 'legal' part of her career, has many caustic remarks to make on the small self-denials which characterise this stage of her history. Not only did they teach their pupils, but made clothes for them, and grudged money for any other object than the benefit of the poor who were then suffering under the extraordinary severities of the winter of 1801. For the use of her pupils she now wrote her first story for the poor, and amongst her most successful. Many may doubt the use or even propriety of so circumstantial a story as 'Susan Grey,' on such a critical and delicate subject, but we believe it was suited for the peculiar temptations of the time for which it was written, and it was received with wonderful favour by the public. She has to apologise in her autobiography for its theology, or rather to renounce it in toto; which we are not surprised at, for even in its amended form some fifteen years after its publication, this story still retains ^a certain sedate orthodox tone, very uncongenial with the authoress's later, we will not say maturer, works, for this quality of maturity was not to be attained by her. At this time we find the following statement of her religious condition:—

'There was evidently all this time a very strong contest going on in my mind, between the love of the world and a sense of the sin and vanity of that love. There is a period in the lives of all young girls in which they are flattered. The peculiar trial of our youth was, that my mother seldom if ever went out with us, to be our guard, and after a while she only permitted us to go out separately. There are memorandums in my old journal, from which I am taking this history, of one of these flatteries, followed by this prayer:—"Oh! my God! others may love the world, but I will follow Thee; others may follow the pleasures of this life, but I will be contented to take up my cross and follow Thee, and I will be numbered among the holy men and prophets and apostles of old."

'Then follows, the next day, a thanksgiving for having been enabled to do my duty to my God, and for having been patient, submissive, and cheerful. Here we find a double deception; first, in the resolutions formed of doing all things well, and, secondly, in the persuasion, which seems to have been entertained the next day, that all things had been so done, so far as occasion had served.

'The lesson, therefore, which in due time must be learnt by all, that man is nothing, and that God is all in all, was still to be acquired by me from its very commencement.'—P. 220.

And soon after are recorded some rules, written on occasion of her mother's leaving home for a time. We are far from disputing that possibly something may have been wrong, that

there may have been trusting in *self* at this time, yet such strivings (we fully believe earnest strivings) after a religious and consistent life must create an interest in the framer of them:—

‘As soon as she was gone, I wrote a set of rules to be kept in her *absence*. 1. To rise as early as I can awake. 2. To spend my time in prayer till my mother is up. 3. To devote certain hours to my mother. 4. To read my Bible after breakfast. 5. Never to walk in the streets but when sent by my mother, or when any poor people require. 6. To go to church every Wednesday or Friday. 7. Never to indulge a worldly thought. All these rules were very well meant, and some of them perfectly right, but all were built upon a false estimation of my own powers, and a false apprehension of the Divine plans with man. As a matter of course, the account of the few next days, in which I was left alone with my mother, was only a record of the breaking sometimes of one, sometimes of another, and sometimes of all these resolutions.’—P. 221.

These mystic allusions to the ‘Divine plans with man,’ and the like, must, we conclude, have some reference to her recent universalist views, for ordinary Christians must believe it part of the divine plan that men should lead holy lives.

In 1803 she married her cousin, Henry Sherwood, to whose singular adventures one chapter of this work is devoted. His father, having chosen to reside in France, the son got entangled, while quite a boy, in the difficulties, and finally, in the horrors of the French Revolution, from which he escaped, at the age of from eighteen to twenty, to England, in an absolutely destitute condition. The story from his own journal recalls to us Dickens’ hero in a similar predicament. Some little money had been lent to him for his passage by some friend of his father’s, so it chanced he was not penniless when he neared the home of his relations, by whom he could not hope to be recognised:—

“‘Imagine me, then, dressed like a beggar, with my foraging cap, my old dusty black coat, minus one skirt, with no stockings nor neckerchief, asking admission on a Sunday evening at a neat tea-drinking public-house. It was no wonder they would not receive me. Exhausted and heart-broken, within ten or eleven miles of the end of my journey, having gone through so much, and now so unkindly used near home, I fell fainting at the door.

‘When, after a while forgetting my sorrows, I came to myself, I found that I had been taken into the house and tenderly treated, but I did not dare tell my history there, for I was afraid, though I repeatedly said that I had no need of money.

‘I recollect they gave me brandy-and-water, and I passed a quiet night, and in the morning I proceeded on foot.

‘I had been taught by my father that if I showed myself in Coventry in my worn-out dress, that our family would be disgraced for ever. My business was now to get to a great-aunt, my grandfather’s sister, in such a manner as not to be known hereafter. How foolish we all are! just as if any persons were thinking of me, or troubling their heads to recognise Henry Sherwood in the travel-soiled, wayworn beggar that I then appeared. The skin being changed, the whole animal was changed also in

an instant, for I had not the manners of the beggar. But I was very ill, and I often stopped and rested. Once, whilst leaning against a milestone, a postchaise passed, in which were two young ladies and a gentleman. The young ladies laughed at me, pointing me out, saying, "See that drunken lad."

'I was very much hurt at this remark; but I met these same young ladies at my grandmother's within the week, and they had no idea I was the same poor wretch leaning against the milestone, and I kept the story to myself.

'At Nuneaton I bought a pair of stockings, and smartened myself up as well as I could. I at length entered Coventry; but I had now forgotten the streets, and no wonder, for I had not been there since I was seven years old. The street, indeed, I at last found, but not the house. I knew, indeed, where my trustee lived, for his house was very large; my grandfather had built it, and it was called the Priory, and was sufficiently marked by its iron gates, and its relative situation to S. Michael's and Trinity Churches; but here I was ashamed to go.

'My old great-aunt I remembered well, and I walked along the street, looking in at each window to see her; at length I did see her dear old face, and I knocked very lightly and humbly at the door. It was opened, and there stood Susan—Sukey they always called her—she had been in the family before I was born. She did not know me; but was shutting to the door with "Go to the mayor, go." "I—I—I am Henry Sherwood," I said.

'Of course I was at once admitted, and at once taken to bed. The surgeon was summoned, and he pronounced my disease the scarlet fever, and I lost all recollection for days.'—Pp. 212—214.

This romantic introduction to the notice of his English friends would no doubt be a powerful recommendation to his cousin Mary, who was his senior by some two years. He was evidently struck with her from the first, and saw as much of her as he could. He entered the army when of age, and joined the 53d regiment, then stationed in the West Indies. Five years later, on his return, he made his offer, and in the same year they were married, not then knowing that the ultimate destination of his regiment was the East Indies. The marriage was a most happy one. Hers was the influencing mind: perhaps she could not have been very happy under any other arrangement, and we gather throughout, in her tone of tender patronage towards her husband, that this was acknowledged by both. It was so when she first led him to the daily reading of the Bible with her, though he had shocked her soon after their union by a confession that he did not fully believe its contents; it was so still, when she set him to work an old man with abundance of leisure, to learn Hebrew and make an Hebrew Concordance, which she says 'has prevented him from spending many and many a weary hour,' adding, complacently, 'he has worked at it now for many years, and is going through it 'the second time for correction.' How many husbands with nothing to do would be the better for wives so ingenious in suggestions of employment! A great deal of active service was

however to intervene between these two periods, in which we may gather that Captain Sherwood did his own duty well.

Nearly two years elapsed between their marriage and sailing for India, in which she experienced the vicissitudes and changes a soldier's wife must make up her mind to, and for which she was well suited. She was still deeply engaged on the subject of religion, which, according to her natural temperament, she pursued in a very energetic spirit:—

‘My religious duties I chose to make very laborious at Sunderland. Here I had comparatively few interruptions, and much time for observing my rules. There are twenty-one daily tasks, self-appointed in my journal. Six of these are forms of prayer, three are Bible readings, and the other eleven are more secular. At this place I began to study the Bible in a regular way, though in much darkness.’—P. 250.

A great trial came, when she had to decide to leave her baby in England, and as the maternal instinct was strong in her, and she was moreover a baby lover in its widest sense, having an impulse to adopt every motherless baby that came in her way, it must have been a very keen one. Her journal written after this heavy parting, records a little lament with more simplicity, pathos, and poetry in it, than her inventive faculty in itself had ever power to conceive:—

“The last time I saw my Mary,” I find written in my journal, “she was sitting on her nurse’s lap. She was eleven months and eighteen days old. Oh, my baby! my little baby! She could then walk a few paces alone. She could call mamma, and tell me what the lambs said. Oh, this state of bereavement—this parting—this life in which we are as dead to each other! My mother, my sister, you who have taken my infant under your care, you will feel for her and be tender with her. My babe will be brought up amongst lambs and flowers, among sweet woods and hills, near where her mother, who will then be far away, was brought up. She will be educated in the fear of God, if she lives; if not, she will be taken to her Heavenly Father’s bosom. My beloved baby—oh, my God! bless my baby.”—P. 267.

And now commences her Indian life, which takes up at least half the volume, and contains the scenes of greatest interest in the narrative. The history of the voyage to Madras is given at full length, for our authoress, prolix always, is not likely to have mended in later life, nor to have grown more discriminating in the choice of subjects best suited for the public ear, and yet it must in all autobiographers be difficult indeed to decide on what is or is not worth telling, and this first half of the volume which we have already gone through, containing only the record of an ordinary domestic life, with no adventures beyond what may fall to any lot (for *some* changes there must be in all) presents this difficulty, in a peculiar degree, which only a very lively and graphic style can get over. A charming style carries us pleasantly

along, wherever a writer chooses to take us; but the histories of family gatherings and dispersings, the changes from town to country and from country to town, the details of journeys, the stoppages at inns, the meals, the delays, the chance companions of an hour, the little slights and little compliments, and little differences of early life, told after an interval of fifty years, in a flow of very common-place words, each incident accompanied by an appropriate religious or moral reflection—make up a book of very moderate attractions; and if our readers have followed us so far with any degree of interest they must bless the art of selection and abridgement, which gives them this pleasure at so small a cost of time and patience. Most persons engaged in the task of autobiography have mingled amongst persons well-known and remarkable in some way, but it was not so with our authoress,—a call on Mrs. Hannah More, a morning visit to Mrs. E. Hamilton, a sight of Mrs. Carter, and a dinner with Paley, all briefly recorded, are hitherto almost all the well-known names we can call to mind. It was different in India, where her own life was one necessarily of more novelty, where her peculiar gifts of active benevolence found ample and yet judicious exercise, and where she was admitted to the intimacy of men distinguished throughout the church for their zealous labours for the propagation of the Gospel of Christ. The first work in India must be the domestic one of forming an establishment, and as Mr. Sherwood's income was ample, theirs was on the usual scale of that magnificent country. But though thus relieved from every household care but that of superintendence, and, as we learn afterwards, abandoning the use of her needle for many and many a year, indolence was never one of her temptations, not even under the first influence of the heat and luxury of the new climate. Her passion was education, and very praiseworthy were her efforts for the good of all the children who at all came within her sphere. We find very early this notice:—

‘In agreement with what were then my ideas of the necessity of works for salvation, instead of taking the rest in Fort William which my health and situation required, I began, after a few days, to instruct William Durham, the same little boy whom I had taught to read in “The Devonshire.” I soon added another pupil, the still dearly beloved child of a friend of my husband and myself, George, the eldest son of Captain and Mrs. Whetstone, of our corps.’—P. 295.

So ‘dark’ was she at this period, as she informs us, that she has to record the anxieties which visited her on the subject of the baptism of the child whose birth she was looking forward to, lest there should be no ordained minister at Dinapore to confer this blessing. She made it the subject of prayer, and the prayer

was granted, for a clergyman of the Church of England chanced to be at the station at the time of the birth of her first-born son.

The careless irreligious habits of the English residents in India grieved her at this time deeply, and no doubt her influence in correcting Sunday desecration, and other errors of a like nature, was exercised for good.

‘I was, however, very uneasy at the sad way in which our Sundays were spent; but I could not prevail immediately to have things altered.

‘About this time a plan was formed, without any trouble on my part, for the establishment of a regimental school, and as this school afterwards formed a very prominent feature in my Indian life, I think it necessary to explain somewhat particularly how the affair originated. There was at that time no provision made by government for the instruction of the children of soldiers; but this year at a dinner party, but at whose house I cannot say, the subject being discussed, Mr. Sherwood and myself at once offered to receive the children in our quarters, if it was agreed upon that a school should be established, and Mr. Sherwood offered his clerk to assist me in the undertaking.

‘The children were only to be present from eight till twelve every day, quite drudgery enough in that climate, and rather too much for me in some respects, as I was never without a baby whilst I was in India.’—P. 303.

This school, which at first consisted of eighteen pupils, soon increased to forty or fifty, consisting chiefly of the children from the barracks, and a very trying provoking little class they were, from the neglect, and the knowledge of evil in which they were trained; but such difficulties were never allowed to be any hindrance to her. It was about this time, after the birth of another child, and while sadly watching the death-bed of her first-born, that we meet with the following assertion:—

‘I cannot exactly say at what time, but it was either in this month of May or of June, that, one day in conversation with our chaplain, I betrayed my total ignorance respecting the doctrine of human depravity. I seemed at times to have been astonished and dismayed by my own depravity, and this uneasiness was, of course, greatly increased by the idea which I entertained, that other religious people were free from my infirmities.

‘It would be strange to think how I could have remained thus blind to this doctrine when reading the Bible, as I did every day, if we did not see this same blindness frequently at this time amongst well-meaning people.

‘Our Chaplain was undoubtedly my first teacher (through the Divine Spirit) of this very essential truth, that man’s nature is depraved, for he admitted this doctrine as explained in our ninth Article.’—Pp. 321, 322.

We do not know what to say to such statements as these. If a person is aware of her own depravity of heart, one great practical use of the doctrine is at least hers, nor can we understand a constant and careful reader of the Bible being ignorant to the degree she asserts, with such admonitions too, from her own conscience. Those in any way acquainted with her writings, and with the harsh technicalities of her phraseology in enforcing the doctrine of human depravity upon her childish readers,

must suspect that she dates more from a formula she began to use from that time, than from the first moment of conviction; her mind being no doubt open to deep religious impressions in the anguish of parting from her child. She was assisted too to dwell upon the thought by what she considers a happy stroke of imagination in personifying original sin in her 'Infant Pilgrim's Progress,' a little work on which she was then engaged.

It must be familiar to all Mrs. Sherwood's readers, that the commonest device in her plots is the adopting of orphans—a very rare occurrence in actual life, and which certainly adds to that air of unreality which characterises all her stories. It is satisfactory to find that this benevolent impulse which she attributes to mankind in general, was at least real in her husband and herself, and that they largely acted on the principle, (whether suited for general practice or not) which she so forcibly recommends. The idea first occurred to her husband after the death of their little Henry, though it could not be immediately carried out:—

'I often used to weep over my lovely, solitary Lucy. I felt very sad that this, my third child, should be alone, without brother or sister, and I permitted this regret one day to escape me in the presence of Mr. Sherwood. He was so much affected by my sorrow, that he made me a proposal which much pleased me, and which just suited my feelings. "Would you," he said, "like to adopt a little orphan from the barracks, some little motherless child, who might be a companion to our Lucy?" I rejoiced greatly when Mr. Sherwood made this kind proposition to me, and he immediately left me to make inquiries for an orphan child in the barracks.

'I can give no account of the feeling which led me so eagerly to accept his proposal, for I still had one child left with me, and I was of an age to suppose I might have many more; neither did I then thoroughly understand the condition of white orphans in India. But all that I can now say is, that it pleased God (in whose hands are the hearts of all men) so at that time to fill my heart with feelings of pity for little children, that there was no length which I would not have gone to serve them, babies especially.'—Pp. 329, 330.

However, no orphan was now to be found of an age or sex suited for her need. It was on their change of station on the route to Benares that they stopped at Dinapore and became acquainted with Henry Martyn, with whom they subsequently grew very intimate. Such an interest hangs over every record of this ardent loving spirit, that to us the few notices of him form the most engaging part of the volume, illustrating as they do, even the slightest of them, the depth and beauty of those Christian graces by which his course was actuated. Not that Mrs. Sherwood can profess entire sympathy with him; she considers him, on the contrary, in the dark, in a great many points. She thus describes her first introduction to him:—

'Mr. Martyn received Mr. Sherwood not as a stranger, but as a brother, —the child of the same father. As the sun was already low, he must needs

walk back with him to see me. I perfectly remember the figure of that simple-hearted and holy young man, when he entered our budgerow. He was dressed in white, and looked very pale, which, however, was nothing singular in India; his hair, a light brown, was raised from his forehead, which was a remarkably fine one. His features were not regular, but the expression was so luminous, so intellectual, so affectionate, so beaming with Divine charity, that no one could have looked at his features, and thought of their shape or form,—the out-beaming of his soul would absorb the attention of every observer. There was a very decided air, too; of the gentleman about Mr. Martyn, and a perfection of manners which, from his extreme attention to all minute civilities, might seem almost inconsistent with the general bent of his thoughts to the most serious subjects. He was as remarkable for ease as for cheerfulness, and in these particulars this journal does not give a graphic account of this blessed child of God. . . .

‘Mr. Martyn invited us to visit him at his quarters at Dinapore, and we agreed to accept his invitation the next day. Mr. Martyn’s house was destitute of every comfort, though he had multitudes of people about him. I had been troubled with a pain in my face, and there was not such a thing as a pillow in the house. I could not find anything to lay my head on at night but a bolster, stuffed as hard as a pin-cushion. We had not, as is usual in India, brought our own bedding from the boats. Our kind friend had given us his own room: but I could get no rest during the two nights of my remaining there, from the pain in my face, which was irritated by the bolster; but during each day, however, there was much for the mind to feed upon with delight. After breakfast Mr. Martyn had family prayers, which he commenced by singing a hymn. He had a rich, deep voice, and a fine taste for vocal music. After singing he read a chapter, explained parts of it, and prayed extempore. Afterwards he withdrew to his studies and translations. The evening was finished with another hymn, scripture reading, and prayers. The conversion of the natives and the building up of the kingdom of Christ were the great objects for which alone that child of God seemed to exist then, and, in fact, for which he died. His views on these subjects were then what were entertained by all religious persons in England—views which are, I believe, generally entertained under various modifications by those who are called evangelical.’—Pp. 338, 339.

Here follows a long misty passage on the millennium, involving some of her most questionable opinions, but too obscurely for general comprehension. She continues:—

‘Influenced by the belief that man’s ministry was the instrumentality which, by the Holy Spirit, would be made effectual to the work, we found him labouring beyond his strength, and doing all in his power to excite other persons to use the same exertions. How far they influenced us may be seen in the sequel. I can recollect that it was chiefly whilst walking with him on the Plain, on the Saturday and Sunday evenings, that he opened his mind to us on these subjects; explaining his various plans, and the difficulties he had already met with in other matters relative to religion, which I do not exactly now remember. This, however, I can never forget, that Henry Martyn was one of the very few persons whom I have ever met who appeared never to be drawn away from one leading and prevailing object of interest, and that object was the promotion of religion. He did not appear like one who felt the necessity of contending with the world and denying himself its delights, but rather as one who was unconscious of the existence of any attractions in the world, or of any delights

which were worthy of his notice. When he relaxed from his labours in the presence of his friends, it was to play and laugh like an innocent, happy child, more especially if children were present to play and laugh with him.—P. 340.

In the course of the same journey she became acquainted with Mr. Corrie, the great friend of Henry Martyn, afterwards Bishop of Madras, of whom also a most agreeable impression of zeal and amiable simplicity of life is given. When established at Cawnpore, the barrack school was established, and very hard Mrs. Sherwood worked in it. In a country where most English ladies thought themselves exonerated by the climate from every unnecessary exertion, it was something for a woman, who might have indulged herself in every pleasure that idleness or society could give, to apply herself to the real drudgery of a school with the patient perseverance she did, hearing four classes every day—herself clothing many of the most destitute, urging upon others the duty of helping in the cause, placing out orphans in some cases, and taking them into her own house in others, and at the same time neglecting no domestic duties, acting in all things with her husband's cordial sanction and cooperation, and tenderly devoted to her own children, whose early death in two instances were her great sorrow. These are acts which must be admired, and which must receive our approbation. After describing the reception into her own family of two interesting little orphan girls, one of whom, Annie Childe, makes a considerable figure in this part of the book, and the circumstances which led her to adopt them, we have the following incident, which gives us a good idea of the power of her influence amongst the people around her, and the way in which it worked. Hearing of a motherless baby in the regiment, who was supposed to be ill-treated and starved by the woman who had taken it in charge:—

‘ Having Mr. Sherwood's consent to all I did, I sent the next morning to the barracks to desire the woman who had the care of Serjeant Pownal's infant to come and bring the child to me, which, however unwilling she might be, she did not dare to refuse, and so well was I known that even the father could have scarcely withheld the child from me had he wished it. I perfectly remember the time, and where I stood when the babe was brought in. I was in the nursery; Mrs. Parker, some black women, and also the bearer who attended the children, were with me. It was noon-day, and I had dismissed the school. The soldier's wife, as I said, was brought before me: she was young, sandy complexion, and hair inclined to red—a coarse and disagreeable person; in her arms she carried the child; the skin about the infant's mouth was stretched until the mouth and teeth were quite prominent; the cheeks were fallen in, the eyes staring, and the whole physiognomy that of the most eager famine. The little creature was very pale, and had very light and soft hair. The child wore a muslin frock, which had been hastily put on, and there were little long sleeves rudely attached to the short ones. The frock was clean, but the child had

no other garment than the frock. The woman looked defiance at us all when I put the question to her—"Is this child ill?" "Yes," she answered, "very ill." "I do not think it," I said; and going near to the baby to examine her more closely, she stretched out her arms to me and struggled faintly. Those little arms, and that little eager, helpless appeal, was rendered effectual by Him in whose hands are the hearts of all men, to turn and direct them to His own purposes. "And now," I said to the woman, having received the little one in my arms, "now you may go; the child needs you no more." She refused to go without the babe, and would have been very impertinent, had not the white women, with the other servants, taken up the cause, and the bearer very quietly followed her till he saw her without the gates. I must just add, that the father expressed himself truly grateful. The woman was no sooner gone than Mrs. Parker began to provide for the baby's comfort. She first bathed and dressed her, and as the poor child had not power to sit up straight, we laid her on a little mattress, and we procured an Ayar to attend her; we gave her from time to time a few spoonfuls of very light food, such as we made for the youngest baby: but for weeks she was so ravenous that she would have eaten everything which she could lay her little hands upon. We found very soon that the child had no disease whatever, and that she was suffering merely from famine, though the wretched woman had persuaded the father that she was very ill. As I said above, he was very thankful for all I was doing for his child, and deeply grieved when he knew of her past sufferings.—Pp. 346, 347.

At Cawnpore they were again so fortunate as to have Henry Martyn appointed chaplain of that station. She describes his arrival, brought in fainting after a long journey in the intense heat, the consequence of which was a fever, which detained him long at their house, and led of course to increased intimacy; for the warmth and friendliness of his nature, his delight in social intercourse, if at all congenial, the blending of love of God and love of man, which make his character shine out with such peculiar sweetness in every record of him, must have made a welcome and delightful guest.

The strivings after holiness of life, the morbid self-scrutiny, the sad notices of temptation, and inward struggles against the evil of his nature, which that singular record, his journal,—so valuable as a mind's true picture, so dangerous if taken as a model for general imitation,—brings to light, win even more of our sympathy, when we learn how pure, how gentle, how patient and cheerful, how beaming with Christian love the whole life of this man showed itself to all admitted to the privilege of intercourse with him. It is the simplicity of his character which these memoirs bring out: showing how naturally and unaffectedly he could adapt himself to every scene,—how readily resign himself to all circumstances—

'When Mr. Martyn got a little better he became very cheerful, and seemed quite happy with us all about him. He commonly lay on his couch in the hall during the morning, with many books near to his hand, and amongst these always a Hebrew Bible and a Greek Testament. Soon,

very soon, he began to talk to me of what was passing in his mind, calling to me at my table to tell me his thoughts. He was studying the Hebrew characters, having an idea, which I believe is not a new one, that these characters contain the elements of all things, though I have reason to suppose he could not make them out at all to his satisfaction; but whenever anything occurred to him he must needs make it known to me. . . .

'In a very few days he had discerned the sweet qualities of the orphan Annie, and had so encouraged her to come about him that she drew her chair, and her table, and her green box to the vicinity of his couch. She showed him her verses, and consulted him about the adoption of more passages into the number of her favourites. Annie had a particular delight in all the pastoral views given in Scripture of our Saviour and of his church; and when Mr. Martyn showed her this beautiful passage, "Feed Thy people with Thy rod, the flock of Thine heritage which dwell solitarily in the wood in the midst of Carmel" (Micah vii. 14), she was as pleased with this passage as if she had made some wonderful acquisition. As I have remarked in the history of my Indian orphans, what could have been more beautiful than to see the senior wrangler and the almost infant Annie thus conversing together, whilst the elder seemed to be in no way conscious of any condescension in bringing down his mind to the level of the child's?'—Pp. 357, 358.

He soon formed acquaintance with the few religious soldiers of the regiment, and established certain extempore private services with them, of which we find mention in his journals: for the peculiar practices of the school in which he had grown zealous for the truth were persevered in by him. These men had at first to go through a good deal of persecution in their regiment, on account of their religion; but the influence of the colonel, rightly exerted, stopped this. It is remarked, that when all difficulties were thus overcome, many who had been most zealous under persecution fell quite away and never returned.

'I must not omit in this place another anecdote of Mr. Martyn, which amused us much at the time after we had recovered the alarm attending it. The salary of a Chaplain is large, and Mr. Martyn had not drawn his for so long a time, that the sum amounted perhaps to some hundreds. He was to receive it from the collector at Cawnpore. Accordingly, he one morning sent a note for the amount, confiding the note to the care of a common Cooley, a porter of low caste, generally a very poor man. This man went off, unknown to Mr. Sherwood and myself, early in the morning. The day passed, the evening came, and no Cooley arrived. At length Mr. Martyn said in a quiet voice to us, "The Cooley does not come with my money. I was thinking this morning how rich I should be; and, now, I should not wonder in the least if he has not run off, and taken my treasure with him." "What," we exclaimed, "surely you have not sent a common Cooley for your pay?" "I have," he replied. Of course we could not expect that it would ever arrive safe; for it would be paid in silver, and delivered to the man in cotton bags. Soon afterwards, however, it did arrive, a circumstance at which we all greatly marvelled.'—P. 360.

The Arab Sabat, the Christian convert employed by him to assist in his translation of the Scriptures, formed at this time part of his household. This man's subsequent apostasy and frightful death must be familiar to most of our readers. There

was a certain wild ferocity about him, and total disregard of truth at this time, which made him an object of suspicion, though his talents for his work and his religious professions, which could not be wholly hypocritical, enabled him to maintain such a hold over his employer, as certainly betrays both want of natural discernment, and the use of false tests in matters spiritual. One of his uses, however, to Henry Martyn seems to have been by his caprices and ingratitude, to strengthen and refine his great gift of patience. The description of a learned missionary's household is thus given:—

‘It was a burning evening in June, when after sunset I accompanied Mr. Sherwood to Mr. Martyn's bungalow, and saw for the first time its avenue of palms and aloes. We were conducted to the cherbuter, where the company was already assembled, among which there was no lady but myself. This cherbuter was many feet square, and chairs were set for the guests; and a more heterogeneous assembly surely had not often met, and seldom, I believe, were more languages in requisition in so small a party. Besides Mr. Martyn and ourselves, there was no one present who could speak English. But let me introduce each individual separately; and first, Sabat, for whose physiognomy I recommend my readers to study any old sign of the Saracen's head which may chance to be in his neighbourhood. Every feature in the large disk of Sabat's face was what we should call exaggerated. His eyebrows were arched, black, and strongly pencilled; his eyes dark and round, and from time to time flashing with unsubdued emotion, and ready to kindle into flame on the most trifling occasion. His nose was high, his mouth wide, his teeth large, and looked white in contrast with his bronzed complexion and fierce black moustachios. He was a large and powerful man, and generally wore a skull-cap of rich shawling, or embroidered silk, with circular flaps of the same hanging over each ear. His large tawny throat and neck had no other covering than that afforded by his beard, which was black. His attire was a kind of jacket of silk, with long sleeves, fastened by a girelle, or girdle, about his loins, to which was appended a jewelled dirk. He wore loose trousers, and embroidered shoes turned up at the toes. In the cold season he threw over this a wrapper lined with fur, and when it was warmer the fur was changed for silk. When to this costume is added ear-rings, and sometimes a golden chain, the Arab stands before you in his complete state of Oriental dandyism. This son of the desert never sat in a chair without contriving to tuck up his legs under him on the seat, in attitude very like a tailor on his board. The only languages which he was able to speak were Persian, Arabic, and a very little bad Hindostanee; but what was wanting in the words of this man was more than made up by the loudness with which he uttered them, for he had a voice like rolling thunder. When it is understood that loud utterance is considered as an ingredient of respect in the East, we cannot suppose that one who had been much in native courts should think it necessary to modulate his voice in the presence of the English Sahib Logues. The second of Mr. Martyn's guests, whom I must introduce as being not a whit behind Sabat in his own opinion of himself, was the Padre Julius Cæsar, an Italian monk of the order of the Jesuits, a worthy disciple of Ignatius Loyola. Mr. Martyn had become acquainted with him at Patna, where the Italian priest was not less zealous and active in making proselytes than the Company's chaplain, and probably much more wise and subtle in his movements than the latter. The Jesuit was a handsome young man, and dressed in the complete costume of the

monk, with his little skull-cap, his flowing robes, and his cord. The materials, however, of his dress were very rich; his robe was of the finest purple satin, and his cord of twisted silk, and his rosary of costly stones, whilst his fair and manner were extremely elegant. He spoke French fluently, and there Mr. Sherwood was at home with him, but his native language was Italian. His conversation with Mr. Martyn was carried on partly in Latin and partly in Italian. A third guest was a learned native of India, in his full and handsome Hindostanee costume; and a fourth, a little, thin, copper-coloured, half-caste Bengalee gentleman, in white nankeen, who spoke only Bengalee. Mr. Sherwood made a fifth, in his scarlet and gold uniform; myself, the only lady, was the sixth; and add our host, Mr. Martyn, in his clerical black silk coat, and there is our party. Most assuredly I never listened to such a confusion of tongues before or since. Such a noisy, perplexing Babel can scarcely be imagined. Every one who had acquired his views of politeness in Eastern society was shouting at the top of his voice, as if he had lost his fellow in a wood; and no less than seven languages were in constant request, viz. English, French, Italian, Arabic, Persian, Hindostanee, Bengalee, and Latin.—Pp. 366—368.

In speaking of the many interesting conversations held about this time with Mr. Martyn and his friends, on the state and prospects of religion in India, and its more intimate concern with each soul, our authoress, alluding mysteriously, as she often does, to the new light since vouchsafed to her, says:—

‘I now ask, after many years—And did these glowing and, I believe, heavenly-inspired hopes of these children of God fall short of the truth of what shall really be? Yes; for, inasmuch as the nature of man is limited, he cannot comprehend the boundless love of the Divinity. We believed that this world, at some future time, should be a holy world; and this I still believe; but I thank God that I have ceased to believe that man, unaided by the Spirit, can accomplish this mighty work, for I now know that God alone can do it. Is it not asked, “When our Lord shall come, shall he find faith on the earth?” We walked then as mere babes; and yet, I humbly trust, as children having been brought to desire to do their Father’s will.’—P. 376.

What Christian ever thought that man, unaided by the Spirit, ‘could do any mighty work?’ But we quote this as showing the sort of assumption of inspiration which frequently occurs.

The reader of Mr. Martyn’s journal must be aware of innumerable passages in which he laments and reproaches himself for the difficulty he finds in introducing religious conversation into general society. He had not arrived at the age for independent thought on such matters, and desired to act out the principles and practice of the party in the Church of which he was so bright an ornament. We must hope and believe, however, that had he lived he would have greatly modified his ideas in this respect, and proportionably changed his practice. It ought to cost a man some effort to discourse on the soul’s most momentous concerns: in all deep minds it must ever do so; but with fluent shallow talkers nothing is more easy, and in intercourse

with such a mind as his nothing more delightful. There could be no deep sympathy—we, reading both their inner thoughts, may pronounce positively that there was none—between Henry Martyn and Mrs. Sherwood; but there was apparent agreement, and may she not at this period, and under the sanction at least of his practice, have begun to acquire that ease and decision in treating religious matters which, expressed in her shallow thoughtless style, often produce such insufferable results, as well to our tastes as to our deeper instincts? Common minds admitted into close intercourse with superior ones, are apt not so much to appreciate the true nature of the privilege as to value themselves upon it, and to assume a certain intellectual elevation. Henry Martyn's confessions to her, from the experiences of his inmost heart, of sin warring in him, in spite of a renewed nature, may have resulted in Mrs. Sherwood in such flippant enunciations of the doctrine of original sin as we find everywhere in her books, such as 'Yes, we are then all murderers, my dear young people,' and innumerable other similar off-hand unrealized assertions, more likely to provoke a smile in 'the dear young people' than to touch the heart or conscience.

The birth of another daughter so far decided her on leaving her husband and returning to England with her infant, that they repaired to Calcutta, and were on the point of securing her passage. As a last thought, she consulted the leading physician there, and he gave it as his opinion that the child might live for some years in India; and then follows some, no doubt, valuable experience on the treatment of English children in that climate, chiefly gathered from the observation of native women. The child did live; and on their return to Cawnpore we have more particulars of Henry Martyn and his system with the natives. He had a Sunday evening congregation of beggars, whom he *paid* for their attendance—a proceeding watched somewhat jealously by the government authorities, who had then a strange dread of interfering with the heathenism around them.

'Another of Mr. Martyn's works at Cawnpore during the late cold season was collecting together and preaching to the Yogeas and Fakeers, a sort of persons who abound in every part of India, persons who, under a thin veil of superstition, are thieves, rogues, and murderers, the very vilest of the vile. It was whilst we were absent that he commenced this strange and apparently unpromising labour. Every Sunday evening the gates of his compound were opened, and every one admitted who chose to come, and then placing himself on his cherbuter, he from thence addressed these people. These Fakeers and Yogeas (Mussulmaun and Hindoo saints) are organized bodies, having their king or supreme in every district. They amount to hundreds in every large station, and, as it has lately been better understood, act in concert to gull the people. Even we English, in all our

pretended wisdom, have been often deceived by them as well as the poor ignorant natives. I remember once seeing a man standing by the river side, who was said to have stood there in one attitude for many years, until his beard and his nails had grown to an enormous length, and the very birds had built their nests in his hair. We, of course, marvelled not a little at this prodigy; but we did not suspect, what has since been discovered, that this appearance is always kept up by three or four persons, who combine together to relieve guard, watching their opportunities to make the exchange when no eye is upon them. But horrid as these standing and sitting objects make themselves by wigs and false beards of matted hair, and a thick plaister of cow-dung, they are not worse, if so bad, as many that move about the country, demanding alms from the superstitious or ignorant people. The various contrivances with which they create wonder and excite compassion can hardly be believed in a Christian country. Sometimes Mr. Martyn's garden has contained as many as five hundred of these people on a Sunday evening, and as I dare not let my imagination loose to describe them, I will copy from my Indian journals what I have written of them. "No dreams nor visions excited in the delirium of a raging fever can surpass these realities. These devotees vary in age and appearance; they are young and old, male and female, bloated and wizened, tall and short, athletic and feeble; some clothed with abominable rags; some nearly without clothes; some plastered with mud and cow-dung; others with matted, uncombed locks streaming down to their heels; others with heads bald or scabby, every countenance being hard and fixed, as it were, by the continual indulgence of bad passions, the features having become exaggerated, and the lips blackened with tobacco, or blood red with the juice of the henna. But these and such as these form only the general mass of the people; there are among them still more distinguished monsters. One little man generally comes in a small cart drawn by a bullock; his body and limbs are so shrivelled as to give, with his black skin and large head, the appearance of a gigantic frog. Another has his arm fixed above his head, the nail of the thumb piercing through the palm of the hand; another, and a very large man, has his ribs and the bones of his face externally traced with white chalk, which, striking the eye in relief above the dark skin, makes him appear, as he approaches, like a moving skeleton."—Pp. 409, 410.

This wild congregation he instructed in the moral law, and went over the Ten Commandments with them, very frequently interrupted by groans and curses. No apparent fruit resulted to them from these efforts, but he was cheered the last Sunday of his stay at that station, by finding that his discourses had made a deep impression on a young Mussulman, who, with his companions, had amused themselves by watching the scene, much at their ease, from a summer-house on the wall. This was Abdool Messeeh, afterwards distinguished for the earnest and consistent devotion of his whole life to the service of Christ.

'We often went, too, on the Sunday evenings, to hear the addresses of Mr. Martyn to the assembly of mendicants, and we generally stood behind him on the cherbuter. On these occasions we had to make our way through a dense crowd, with a temperature often rising above 92°, whilst the sun poured its burning rays upon us through a lurid haze of dust. Frightful were the objects which usually met our eyes in this crowd; so many monstrous and diseased limbs, and hideous faces, were displayed before us, and pushed forward for our inspection, that I have often made

my way to the cherbuter with my eyes shut, whilst Mr. Sherwood led me. On reaching the platform I was surrounded by our own people, and yet even there I scarcely dared to look about me. I still imagine that I hear the calm, distinct, and musical tones of Henry Martyn, as he stood raised above the people, endeavouring, by showing the purity of the Divine law, to convince the unbelievers that by their works they were all condemned; and that this was the case of every man of the offspring of Adam, and they therefore needed a Saviour who was both willing and able to redeem them. From time to time low murmurs and curses would arise in the distance, and then roll forward, till they became so loud as to drown the voice of this pious one, generally concluding with hissings and fierce cries. But when the storm passed away, again might he be heard going on where he had left off, in the same calm, steadfast tone, as if he were incapable of irritation from the interruption.

‘Mr. Martyn himself assisted in giving each person his *pice* after the address was concluded; and when he withdrew to his bungalow I have seen him drop, almost fainting, on a sofa, for he had, as he often said, even at that time, a slow inflammation burning in his chest, and one which he knew must eventually terminate his existence. In consequence of this he was usually in much pain after any exertion of speaking.’—Pp. 416, 417.

There are other more domestic insights into his character which we cannot retain from our readers, though at the risk of seeming to depart too long from our main subject:—

‘We spent some hours every morning during the early part of the month of September in taking short voyages on the river; for Mr. Sherwood, Mr. Martyn, and Mr. Corrie hired a pinnace, and we furnished it with a sofa and a few chairs and tables. The children went with us, and their attendants. Mr. Martyn sent a quantity of books, and used to take possession of the sofa, with all his books about him. He was often studying Hebrew, and had huge lexicons lying by him. The nurses sat on the floor in the inner room, and the rest of us in the outer. Well do I remember some of the manœuvres of little Lucy at that time, who had just acquired the power of moving about independently of a guiding hand; by this independence she always used to make her way to Mr. Martyn when he was by any means approachable. On one occasion I remember seeing the little one, with her grave yet placid countenance, her silken hair, and shoeless feet, step out of the inner room of the pinnace with a little mora, which she set by Mr. Martyn’s couch; then, mounting on it, she got upon the sofa, which was low, and next seated herself on his huge lexicon. He would not suffer her to be disturbed, though he required his book every instant. Soon, however, weary of this seat, she moved to Mr. Martyn’s knee, and there she remained, now and then taking his book from him, and pretending to read; but he would not have her removed, for, as he said, she had taken her position with him, and she was on no account to be sent from him.’—Pp. 419, 420.

From Cawnpore he left them to go to Persia, on his darling project of completing his Persian Testament, there to die, after two years of trial and suffering, unalleviated by human care and friendship.

‘On the Sunday before Mr. Martyn left, the church was opened, and the bell sounded for the first time over this land of darkness. The church was crowded, and there was the band of our regiment to lead the singing and the chaunting. . . .

'The Rev. Daniel Corrie read prayers, and Mr. Martyn preached. That was a day never to be forgotten. . .

'From his first arrival at the station, Mr. Martyn had been labouring to effect the purpose which he then saw completed; namely, the opening of a place of worship. He was permitted to see it, to address the congregation once, and then he was summoned to depart. How often, how very often, are human beings called away, perhaps from this world, at the moment they have been enabled to bring to bear some favourite object. Blessed are those whose object has been such a one as that of Henry Martyn. Alas! he was known to be, even then, in a most dangerous state of health, either burnt within by slow inflammation, which gave a flush to his cheek, or pale as death from weakness and lassitude.

'On this occasion the bright glow prevailed—a brilliant light shone from his eyes—he was filled with hope and joy; he saw the dawn of better things, he thought, at Cawnpore, and most eloquent, earnest, and affectionate was his address to the congregation. Our usual party accompanied him back to his bungalow, where, being arrived, he sank, as was often his way, nearly fainting, on a sofa in the hall.'—Pp. 422, 423.

Mr. Corrie had been appointed to Mr. Martyn's place at Cawnpore, and the Sherwoods found him a most zealous and friendly coadjutor in their labours for the children of the regiment. Their schools increased; being added to by many half-caste children. For these children she began to write some of her best known books, which bear on life in India, teaching India-born children English ways, and giving to English children an insight into Indian life. We have not space for the little histories of her pupils, and the little orphans, more peculiarly under her charge. Many died, but all seem to have been cared for and tended with the most maternal care. She never hesitated during her residence in India to receive any child brought to her for instruction, till on one occasion the colonel of a regiment sent a band of young drummers and trumpeters to her, with his compliments, and he would be obliged to her if she would instruct them. Seeing many of these boys were taller than herself she demurred, but eventually could not resist this novel charge, and years after in England she describes a scene with these quondam pupils, then grown men, at Wheedon Barracks, who assembled round her, to confess their gratitude for her instructions and to do her honour. In the midst of these wide-spreading and onerous cares her own family occupied much of her time and thoughts. We have hitherto abstained from recording her maternal raptures, but it would be withholding one feature of her character not to extract some description of baby beauty. Beauty of all sorts, in every sex and age, was her idol. It is satisfactory that this taste was gratified in her own offspring. The loss of this darling daughter, then grown to womanhood, was still fresh in her mind when these memoirs were written; indeed she tells us it was at her instigation chiefly that the task was begun:—

'On the 20th of this month it pleased God to add another little girl to my family. This lovely child was my fifth, and, till then, I had never, only for a short and very painful period, seen two of my children together. This infant was more beautiful, but very like my precious first Lucy. It was the same fair face again; the same fine, oval, and chiselled mouth; the same bright hair and eyes, though not quite so dark. There was scarcely a fault in the exterior of this infant, and it was instantly acknowledged by all who saw her. Mrs. Mawby and Miss Corrie, on the report of her beauty, came that day to see her, and the next day the one brought her husband and the other her brother, to behold a thing so rare as a beautiful new-born babe. Colonel Mawby was not introduced to me, but Mr. Corrie came in, at my request, to baptize her, he being also her godfather. It was my wish to have called her Martha, after my mother; but when Mr. Corrie took her in his arms and heard the name, he laid her quietly down, saying in his playful way, "Then I don't christen her." "What will you please to have her called?" we asked. He answered, "Emily." "Then Emily it shall be," we replied. He took her up again, and gave her this sweet name. Oh, Emily! my Emily! My memory is fuller than my written records. My Emily grew more lovely from day to day; she became fairer and her form more full. She was so spoken of that some even of the young officers came to see her. One of these officers wrote me a note to say that if I would permit him to be her godfather he thought it might do him good, and constrain him to lead a better life than he had hitherto done; an odd idea, but there was something of good feeling in it.'—Pp. 434, 435.

Mr. Corrie was, however, soon to leave them, and Mr. Sherwood himself was beginning to conduct the Hindostanee service, into which the Liturgy had been translated, in the absence of a chaplain, when he was called off to active service, leaving family, school, and even pastoral duties to his wife; who, however, does not seem to have ever felt any call to assume active labours beyond a woman's appropriate sphere. She and a friend did indeed engage a convert to address the beggars after Henry Martyn's plan, themselves being present, but these reprobates approached the ladies with such strong indications of defiance and insult that her friend fled, and our more courageous heroine, though concealing her fears from them, and concluding the ceremony with dignified self-possession, gave up the attempt for the future, assigning herself a task more in her way than 'collecting thieves and devotees;' the result of which was 'the Ayah and Lady.'

They left Cawnpore with regret, but fresh orphans were received by them, and the onerous duties of the school were continued, till the Duke of York issued an order that each regiment should have a schoolmaster, and thus she was relieved, and at a time when this remission of labour was most desirable. They were beginning, indeed, to contemplate a return to England, when Mr. Sherwood, with his regiment, was ordered from Meerat, where they were now stationed, towards the Himalayas, against some of the mountain tribes, leaving the ladies and children

behind them. She gives some details of the war, which we cannot enter into. Here their situation seems to have had its dangers, not we feel sure at all exaggerated, for hers was a courageous spirit. In a letter to her mother, (with one or more trifling exceptions the only letter the book contains,) we find this passage, illustrative of the interests and alarms of this time:—

‘My own Lucy is a very pleasing girl, not speaking partially; she is exceedingly sweet-tempered, and may be managed by any one—very upright and free from deceit. She has an open English countenance and complexion, and is very tender hearted. I was punishing Emily the other day; Lucy stood by reddening; at last she burst into a loud cry, saying in English, with the Hindostanee idiom, “This little sister of mine, I cannot bear to see her weep, because she is very pleasant to me.” The children have a very pretty way of mixing the languages, using the Eastern idiom with the English. “Oh, my papa,” she sometimes says, “my heart is full of grief for my papa, because he is gone very far.” In the military life, where there is affection, the joys and sorrows are more keen and higher wrought than in common life.

‘You can form no idea, my beloved mother, of the spirit which is required in the management of a family in India, particularly when the master is not at home, or rather gone out in dangerous warfare. The natives have no respect for females. Four or five men walk into the parlour, and quarrel altogether before your face, using the lowest and most abusive language, and trying in the night to frighten you with cries of alarm of thieves and fire. The night after Henry went away, one of the men appointed as a guard or watchman came to my window, close to my bed’s head, setting up a great howl and firing off a gun, exclaiming at the same time in Hindostanee, “Come, come, ye thieves, come, come, and I will destroy you; I will cut you down; there they are, there they run.” I thought of “Don Quixote” and the flock of sheep to which he called out so manfully, and could not help laughing, because I knew the men’s tricks; but Mary and Sally and Lucy, who were in another room, were terribly scared. Some ladies in the station, who had not been so long in the country as myself, were almost frightened into fits by the alarming ways of these watchmen. I own that they have made my heart beat a little when they cry “Fire;” but of late they have kept themselves quieter, and the officer left here has been so kind as to let me have an invalid soldier of the regiment to sleep in the house, which has set all things to rights.”—Pp. 469, 470.

She had the comfort now of a visit from Mr. and Mrs. Thomason, who were travelling in the suite of Lord Moira, and of learning from them that a school for white orphans was being planned in Calcutta, under high influence: the peculiar attractions of a child of her adoption, now under the care of the Corries, having been one means of exciting a general interest on this question. We gather from her own remarks that much of the zealous anxiety which she felt at this time, and which excited her to such continued exertion, she afterwards regarded as superfluous and misplaced.

‘And here I must remark, that I was often greatly distressed in my mind by the condition of these native women. I then thought that the evil of

the system belonging to them might and ought to be remedied. I have not now, as I had then, either hopes or expectations of seeing this world amended. It lieth in wickedness, and always has and always will do so, till the blessed One shall take the government into His own hands."—P. 485.

This passage offers a strange solution to what is said elsewhere, against man's instrumentality, and leads us to suppose, according to the charge of Universalism commonly brought against her, that she came at length to hold the opinion that mankind were not to be brought *out* of their wickedness, but to be saved *in* it, and in spite of it.

We are purposely left in ignorance of dates in this work. Elsewhere we learn that Henry Martyn left Cawnpore in 1810, but how many years after this period the Sherwood family quitted India we are not informed. They decided on this step on the regiment being ordered to Madras; leaving, not without sorrow, the country in which so much had been done and felt. Indeed, to the minds of her friends and admirers this must appear the brightest part of her career. Here there was play for her abundant energies, and here in useful, though self-imposed active duties, she seems to have been kept from those dangerous and presumptuous speculations which disfigure her latest works, and in the end alienated from her the confidence of her party, who had themselves contributed to the heady, arrogant vein, to which she eventually attained by their eager acceptance and warm sanction of much in her writings which should have led to an earlier mistrust.

She describes with some complacency the *eclat* of their disembarking at Liverpool. Their vessel happened to be the first East Indiaman that had arrived at that port since it was opened to vessels from India. If she was really unconscious of singularity in such a scene, it implies the acquisition of very independent habits in her long residence abroad.

'Had "The Roberts" brought a royal party it could not have excited more rejoicing, for the reason above-mentioned. The bells were set to ring on this account—bells that had not rung for years. Our party happened to be the largest from the ship, for we had eight children, and we were followed wherever we went by hundreds of the residents of Liverpool. It must be understood we had not a bonnet in the party: we all wore caps trimmed with lace, white dresses, and Indian shawls. As every person was allowed to land a shawl without duty, each little girl had been made the bearer of one for that purpose. At the quay there were thousands of spectators to welcome us, looking kindly at the fair babes. We walked up with Robinson to the "Talbot," whilst Mr. Sherwood went with the baggage to the custom-house. We did not understand then why we were followed through the streets by such a concourse of people. The little girls trembled lest they and their shawls should be seized, but no one offered to touch us, or anything belonging to us. We were received at the inn with as many expressions of welcome as we had been at the landing-place, and the children excited the same interest. We were led to an upper sitting-

room looking on the street, with its paper-hangings and small neat compartments, which was so strange a sight to us, that one of the little girls said "it was like a box lined with coloured paper." We ordered breakfast, and when the little creatures saw the fresh rolls, &c., they expressed such joy, that the hostess and her maids, who contrived to keep about us, were quite convulsed with merriment. The amazement expressed by these little Indians at all they saw was very entertaining, especially at the feather-beds; and when I threw the baby on one of them and she sank down laughing in it, they quite shrieked, and would have it tried again. The sights seen from the windows, too, the shops and passengers, were an infinite source of delight. . .

'Among our preparations I had not thought of a bonnet, that *sine quâ non* of English attire. The question might be asked, "Had I, in the years of absence from England, so totally forgotten English customs?" and the answer must be, "I suppose that I had."

'Facts are stubborn things. I did not think of these said bonnets, nor did I avail myself of the Saturday to prepare them. There are odd people in the world, and ever have been, and I must be content to sit down among them; my conduct on this occasion leaves it without a doubt.

'On Sunday morning, June the 2d, we were gladdened by the sound of bells calling the people to church. I should have thought it very wrong, after all our mercies, with the memory fresh of the fearful storm of that day fortnight, not to have gone to attend Divine service. So, without hesitation, bonnetless as we were, I went with three of my little girls to a fine church near the inn, and heard a good preacher. His subject was the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. We were put into a seat in the centre of the church. Some old ladies in Liverpool still talk of the Indian family who appeared that day, looking so remarkable with their Indian shawls and lace caps, being apparently and really unconscious of their *outré* appearance. After having been at church, we, with the rest of our family, took a walk in the town, followed by a concourse of people, all of whom looked favourably upon us as the first-fruits of the port, and smiling on the fair children from a far-off land.'—Pp. 511—513.

On rejoining her mother, she found her eldest child, whom she had left an infant, grown almost into womanhood. It was arranged that they should settle near Mrs. Butts, now in very declining health. Mr. Sherwood had leave of absence for two years, and now a natural difficulty presented itself, whether, for the sake of maintaining their present income, he should return to India, or decide to remain with his family on straitened means, a real inconvenience to every member of a household accustomed to all the luxuries and attendance they had been trained to. In this emergency her love of active occupation suggested the plan of increasing their income by taking pupils. Though known as an authoress, she had not thought of this as a means of adding to their resources, though it is implied that eventually her literary occupations proved very remunerative. She liked the society of young people; had clearly none of that love of domestic privacy which makes the admission of strangers to the home circle so great a trial to many, and was happy in her husband, always ready to fall in with and admire her schemes.

There was some idea of his entering the Church, and with a view to seeking ordination, he began a course of study, but this was abandoned.

The family established itself at Wick, near Worcester, and were soon from various causes—amongst others, the death of her mother, and a legacy from another friend,—relieved from all pecuniary cares.

Little remains to be told further of the events of her life. A busy and a pleasant one it seems to have been, peaceful and cheerful, except for the sad breaks of family bereavement, as well as less painful causes of separation in the marriage of many of her children. In this time, her best known works were written, many more we admit than we have any acquaintance with, and all which gained her credit and influence with her party. When past middle life, and finding her family diminished by some of these causes, they spent some time abroad. At Geneva, that change in her views of spiritual things awaited her which so disconcerted her real friends. It followed on her acquaintance with the well-known M. Malan, though how far he himself was a sharer in these views we are left in ignorance.

Their opening conversation is highly illustrative of the mind of our authoress, incapable of feeling what an awful responsibility she had incurred in inculcating false doctrine on the subject of the Divine nature and attributes. She called on M. Malan after hearing him preach :—

‘ When we were seated, after awhile he told me that he knew me well by name; and he told me also that he objected to a passage in my “ Church Catechism Stories,” in which I had asserted “ that Christ, instead of acting according to the will of the Father, had, as it were, by interposing himself between the Father and the sinner, *compelled* him to have mercy.” How kindly, and yet how decidedly, did this enlightened Christian point out my error, proving to me that our Saviour is the exponent of his Father’s love, not the procuring cause of it; for what saith the Witness—“ God so loved the world, that he himself gave us his Son for our salvation.” I recalled to mind that once before I had been told that my views of the Father were very defective, and I prayed that, if I were blind as to the truth, my eyes might be opened. M. Malan lent me a little book called “ Theogenes.”—Pp. 547, 548.

Not less characteristic of her nature, as well as showing most painfully the consequences of an exclusive dwelling on what are understood by Calvinistic doctrines, (though we are very far from attributing to all who hold these views any temptation to the same flippancy in the mode of treating them,) is the following anecdote :—

‘ How sweet and refreshing were the holy discourses I then often had with M. Malan—that true servant of God—and how parentally did he speak to my children, calling them *his* children in the faith. One of my daughters informed me that, for some time past, the idea of the day of

judgment had filled her with terror, that she felt she could never stand the judgment of an all-pure and all-seeing God, and that above all things she wished to hear what M. Malan would say on the subject. I had ever taught my child that the Lord the Saviour would preserve her in judgment if she trusted in Him; but as I had very imperfect views myself at that time of what the Saviour had done, my instructions had failed of giving her satisfaction. In fact, I may say, I fear with truth, that I was then very unable to give a reason for the hope that was within me; for I was clinging to one great and general error—that man had some condition to fulfil, on the non-fulfilment or fulfilment of which his salvation must depend.

M. Malan was scripturally grounded in his views of the perfection of the Divine work, as it regarded the elect, and of the perfect and entire safety of those individuals who are adopted into the body of Christ, and of the total impossibility of their ever being suffered finally to fall away, and hence of the absolute duty of entertaining the doctrine of assurance. On this point, that is, in showing the fulness of Christ as regards His own chosen ones, and the perfect confidence such should place in Him, M. Malan worked hard to instruct my young ones, and what he said was blessed not only to them but to me.

‘Never shall I forget his playful address to my young daughter, when next we met. “*Eh, bien ! ma petite demoiselle, vos oiseaux de nuits le sont-ils volés.*”’—Pp. 548, 549.

Can we regard it as otherwise than shocking to every feeling of reverence, thus to find a minister of the Gospel ridiculing to a young mind, the terrors of that awful judgment day which his Lord and Master himself sets before us for our lasting warning and continual contemplation? It must be noted, too, that a kind of hereditary claim to salvation is here acknowledged, and a spiritual aristocracy implied. It was because this young girl was Mrs. Sherwood's daughter, that he taught her to despise all questionings of her soul's state and final destiny as birds of ill-omen; for he could scarcely assert, that under no circumstances, and by no reasonable being, should such thoughts be ever entertained. But such things speak for themselves.

The following is Mrs. Sherwood's comment, or rather inference from M. Malan's teaching. Our readers must make of it what they can, it is obscure enough; but antinomianism, universalism, and all sorts of ugly isms beside may be supposed to lie hidden in it, as well as in the following reflection, which we find further on:—

‘But this little chasm in my diary admonishes me how impossible it would be for the most correct person to recover and set in order the events of a life of more or fewer years with perfect accuracy, if a few months are so impossible to remember. And oh, how infinitely awful must it be to believe, as the conscience-stricken legalist must do if he is not an infidel, that every idle word that he has ever spoken is recorded against him; the infinite mind being thus brought in terrible array against the finite. Thank God, however, that to me the veil of goatshair has been removed from the face of the Sun of Righteousness.’—Pp. 561, 562.

The 'legalist,' or as we should say, the believer, has certainly very little chance of being understood by the holder of such heady and intoxicating notions.

It is fair to insert the following disclaimer, though wherein she differs from the sect which claimed to fraternise with her is not very clear:—

'It was whilst we were living in Britannia Square, Worcester, a very large parcel arrived from America, containing many splendidly bound volumes, as a present to me. The books were from a numerous party in America, called the "Universalists," from which I disclaim all connexion, as I believe their doctrines, as far as I know them, are a denial of the Holy Scriptures, as they say that the mercy of God is bestowed upon man without the ransom being obtained by Christ. These persons, in their journals, have declared me, and also my daughter Sophia, members of their body; but we wrote at once to disclaim it, though I have reason to think our letters were never published. The works sent, though finely got up, were hateful to us from their sentiments; and Dr. Streeten closed the parcel up again, and forwarded them to a gentleman in Bristol who had dealings in America, who promised to return them from whence they came; and so it was done. It was for the purpose of declaring that my whole trust and confidence are on the righteousness of my Divine Saviour that I then set to work to write a statement of my belief, which I did in the story of Evelyn, in the third volume of "THE FAIRCHILD FAMILY."—Pp. 574, 575.

The autobiography concludes in her seventy-fourth year, with great expressions of praise and thankfulness, it is dated 23d of January, 1847. Amongst them, we find these:—

'Thus my lines are placed in pleasant pastures, and days and months pass, and old age steals on so gently, that now, in my seventy-fourth year, I can read the smallest print, write four or five hours a day, sleep with unbroken rest at night, and declare myself, with grateful heart, one of the very happiest old women that ever cumbered this earth.'—P. 573.

The concluding pages are written by her daughter, Mrs. Kelly, detailing further family changes, with much energy of feeling:—her first husband Dr. Stevens' unexpected death; the loss of her father, after a painful illness; her own engagement to her second husband, Mr. Kelly; and her mother's gradual decline. The concluding scene is thus given:—

'A most careful nurse was with her, and a most faithful attendant, one who has been with us for twelve years, and is still residing at Pinner. As my mother was inclined for sleep, Dr. Kelly would not allow either my sister or myself to sit up, promising he would call us if anything was needed. As I was preparing to leave the room, Dr. Kelly gave her a little draught (chiefly of port wine) to take, which having drank, she returned the glass, kissing his hand as she did so, and then turning to me, she asked his Christian name. On my replying, she took both our hands together in hers. "Hubert," she said, "you will be my son, my dear son; you will be very kind to my child; you will be her protector, and you will be very tender to her, for she has been used to tenderness. You will love me, too, and I shall be very happy with you at Pinner. God is very good."

And then she added, solemnly and clearly, as she bent more over his hand than mine, "Remember this, my children, that God is love. He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him."

'These were the last intelligible words I heard her utter; for when I saw her again, at four in the morning, death had begun its work, though she called me by name, for she knew me.

'I am told by those who could observe the scene that her sufferings were not severe, but though present I can remember nothing of it but that its sorrows made me motherless.'—P. 599.

We have purposely not dwelt longer upon this and similar closing scenes. They contain nothing really remarkable, and yet are of so intimate, and as most would consider, of so private a nature, that the mere reading public ought not to be concerned with them. In what may be termed domestic biography we are sorry to perceive natural reserves more and more laid aside, and the details of family affection, and particulars which should belong only to those most closely connected by the ties of blood or friendship, set forth in print, and exposed to every eye. The details of a parent's suffering, unless some great lesson is to be learnt from them, ought not to be told beyond the sphere of sympathisers—such narratives ought not to have the chance of being indifferently listened to, or carelessly turned over. But this is both a delicate and a difficult subject.

When a life has been passed in the mixed employment of a course of active duties and engagements, and the indulgence of speculative opinion, action will have been found to influence the habits and temper far more than speculations which probably were taken up, and laid down with the pen, the use of which itself becomes in time just so much daily business. Thus, a cheerful amiable old age tells nothing for the truth or effect, one way or another, of those vain dreamy notions which distinguish this authoress's later writings. Nor can we tell to what degree they influenced the inner mind at all. Heretical notions are constantly more influential on the learner than the teacher; on the learner alone do they bear their natural fruit.

In dwelling on a life like this before us, a strong sense of regret remains. We see that a mistake was made both by Mrs. Sherwood and her admirers; she mistook her powers, and was encouraged to misapply them. Her ready, trite, fluent pen, with its power of weaving endless stories,—common-place and full of faults it is true, but with the desideratum of interesting young minds,—was found a valuable party instrument all the more for the want of depth and real thought, which for party purposes are both troublesome things.

It was considered a fine stroke of satire in Molière, to announce to the verse writers of his day, 'The History of Rome in a series of madrigals;' but in our youth it was believed to be

the best way of inculcating the great and awful doctrines of our Faith, to set before children a course of sentimental tales, wherein beautiful girls and fine young men act out for their edification the breach and the observance of the law of God. For the aim Mrs. Sherwood had in view, neither her mind, nor her education, nor, we will add, her sex, at all fitted her—and so that fate befel her which Dante foretels to all who meddle in subjects beyond their depth,—

‘Vie piu che indarno da riva si parte,
Perche non torna qual ei si muove,
Chi pesca per lo vero e non ha l'arte.’

Had her powers been more modestly directed, they might have done good service; for we are constantly surprised in her writings to meet with excellent practical good sense, side by side with arrogant and unfounded presumption and visionary allusions. When she wrote from her own experience, she constantly wrote well and usefully; when she trusted to her supposed deep insight into spiritual things, she as constantly failed. An example of both styles will illustrate our meaning better than further explanation. Mrs. Sherwood was herself, we doubt not, a good and conscientious economist of time, and therefore, from her own practice and observation, she expresses herself wisely in the following passage. We extract from the first volume of the ‘*Lady of the Manor*’—

‘From the time that the infant first draws its breath, until that awful period when the soul forsakes its breathless body, each fitting moment brings with it a certain obligation to the performance of some particular exercise—some unhappy temper is to be restrained; some important lesson to be learned; some new faculty to be acquired; or some latent power to be brought into use. And they who daily endeavour to execute the present task appointed by the all-wise Creator, looking up to him in simple dependence upon His promised assistance, will seldom find that overwhelming accumulation of duties, or that perplexing hurry of business of which so many complain; for the yoke of the Almighty in itself is easy, and his burden light; as all His faithful servants have found in all their generations. Our duties are generally set before us one by one; and commonly speaking, the means of performing these duties are supplied at the same time. A mother has seldom more than one child at a birth; and before her family becomes large, abundant leisure, and space, and opportunity, are given her to mould her first-born child with the Divine blessing into a faithful and powerful instrument for the management of the rest, as well as into a lovely pattern by which its genius may be mutually and sweetly led forward from one degree of excellence to another. But the careless or indolent parent or housekeeper, she who has failed in youth to fit herself for future duties, and who in her early married state has neglected the performance of her little daily tasks of instruction and correction, or of personal labour and inspection, will certainly find herself at length plunged into an abyss of cares and troubles, from which she can never expect to be extricated till she has reached the close of a wretched and wearisome life.’—*Lady of the Manor*, vol. i. p. 140.

This is all extremely sensible and true, and moreover, has that freshness about it in spite of some formality of style that all individual thought has. The next from the same work is a specimen of her powers of assertion, and that privilege of sitting in judgment upon others, in which she so freely indulged, without, certainly, any real data to go upon, for the unhappy young ladies whose state is here so glibly pronounced upon—such as had come under Mrs. Sherwood's observation,—were not likely in the presence, and under the eye of so distinguished a person, to allow themselves in any open improprieties. She must have been guided by some self-chosen unwarrantable test.

'But the greater part of young ladies in England, even the daughters of religious families, give no evidences of being converted, and are, I fear, only kept from open and flagrant offences by motives of worldly prudence, family restraint, custom, and shame.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 269.

This is only one instance of many of the practical business-like nature of her mind, employing itself in the uncongenial field of speculation: anything like doubt or hesitation was alien to her mind; she could be in no person's company without deciding on their spiritual state; she could not entertain the idea of being mistaken, nor see any reason for withholding her convictions from the world as soon as formed; and as in persons so in doctrine, she decided upon these as easily, with as little deliberation, with as full conviction, (if we may misapply the term to this state of mind,) with as free a condemnation of those who differed from her as she could pronounce sentence on a human soul for some act of conformity or nonconformity contrary to her own judgment.

And for a time, this habit gave her weight and influence. It all passed for bold and uncompromising assertion of the truth. While the graces and accomplishments of life, the received customs of society, and what are called worldly amusements were her theme, however ignorantly and indiscriminately condemned, persons, satisfied on the whole, did not think it their part to criticise her mode and style of attack, and much less when she acted with them against certain views of doctrine to which they were opposed, and where she was found an efficient auxiliary. It was only when this habit made such head against all restraints as to turn her round upon her own friends, that the mischief of this arrogant self-reliance was felt and acknowledged; and in the official organ of her party, she was admonished to *humility*, and told that 'pride of intellect had gone before her fall.'¹

There is no reason to suppose that either advice or admonition were of any avail; she evidently, in the latter years of

¹ Christian Observer, 1837, p. 306.

her life, considered herself lifted above the ordinary risks of humanity, and we find her thankful for having been preserved from self-conceit (p. 544), when we cannot but regard her as the real victim of that delusion.

It is time, however, to draw our notice to a conclusion. If in her day she had influence, it may be considered passed, nor can her works, characterised by a trite and common style, ever revive to have real weight. Her system of religious teaching has, we suspect, been found on all hands to be a failure. Her perpetual repetitions of doctrine in the same dull prosy formula, were invariably passed over altogether, or if forced upon her young readers, read with weariness and disgust. Her unreal generalizations on the depravity of human nature were found ineffectual preachers of humility; and even risked deadening the conscience, thus taught to regard sin simply as a condition of our being, and so scarcely to be guarded against, or repented of. Her mystic notions of prophecy and the millennium, so far from producing good, were felt to foster irreverence in childish minds. Her indiscriminate condemnation of many practices in their nature indifferent, and, if not abused, blameless, tended to mystify the instincts of right and wrong; and people found, moreover, that after ever so careful and conscientious a perusal, reading all the didactic parts, and skipping nothing that was dull, what remained longest, and left the most real impressions from her books, was their strong appreciation and exaltation of beauty, wealth, rank, elegance, and all worldly advantages whatever.

Thus, years enable men to see the faults and failures of books, characters, and institutions in highest favour in their own day. Reflections of this kind must be suggested to all thoughtful readers by the present work. Only let us recognise the redeeming element of good intention, not wanting in even the most objectionable of Mrs. Sherwood's works, and, remembering the labours, charities, and kindnesses which distinguish her active career, our severest comments and harshest criticisms will not be given in an uncharitable spirit, nor without much genuine admiration and sympathy for the vigorous, cheerful, affectionate spirit which has here been brought before us in its more congenial sphere of life and action.

- ART. III.—1. *A Letter to a Convocation Man, concerning the Rights, Powers and Privileges of that Body.* 4to. 1697. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. WILLIAM FRASER, B.C.L. J. Masters, London. 1853.
2. *The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods asserted, with particular respect to the Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm and Church of England, occasioned by a pamphlet entitled, 'A Letter to a Convocation Man.'* By WILLIAM WAKE, D.D. 8vo. 1697.
3. *The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, stated and vindicated in answer to a book of Dr. Wake's.* By FRANCIS ATTERBURY. 8vo. 2d edition. 1701.
4. *Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations of the Church of England, historically stated and justly vindicated from the misrepresentations of Mr. Atterbury. Part I.* By WHITE KENNET, D.D. 8vo. 1701.
5. *A History of the English Councils and Convocations, and of the Clergy's meeting in Parliament. In which is also comprehended the History of Parliaments.* By HUMPHREY HODY, D.D. 8vo. 1701.
6. *Synodus Anglicana, or the Constitution and Proceedings of an English Convocation, shown to be agreeable to the principles of an Episcopal Church.* 8vo. 1702. Edited by EDWARD CARDWELL, D.D. Principal of S. Alban's Hall. The University Press, Oxford. 1854.
7. *The State of the Church and Clergy of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, and other public assemblies, Historically deduced from the conversion of the Saxons to the present Times.* By WILLIAM WAKE, D.D., occasioned by a book entitled, '*The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation.*' Fol. 1703.

Of the books on Convocation, which we have placed at the head of our article, two have been lately edited and reprinted, and the others must shortly be so by what we may call a literary necessity. The revival and reform of Convocation is not one of the least important questions even of this eventful time; but it

requires ventilation. Before people can discuss such a subject as it ought to be discussed, they must gain some knowledge of it, and about it. They must have books on it, and must read them. And to examine the question of Convocational Reform, works on Convocational law and history are especially necessary; because every true reformation is a return to first principles; and historical precedents and constitutional facts must, after all, form the only foundation on which a practical reconstruction of our Convocation can be based.

That Convocation will now be reformed,¹ must be considered a settled thing. The sessions of February 1 and July 20 in this present year, have proved to the world that the Synod of the Church of England has now ceased to be a form, and has become a reality. Each of those sessions is an epoch in our church history; and we cannot dwell too earnestly upon what was done in them. The speech of the Bishop of Exeter on February 1st upon the suffrages of Stipendiary Curates, a speech marked by the correctness and the courage which always characterise that Prelate in expressing his opinions; and the polished and convincing rhetoric of the Bishop of Oxford in advocating the cause of Synodal revival, were but minor features in the business of the day, compared with the solemn dignity with which the deliberations of the assembled episcopate all at once, as it were, appeared to be invested, and which seemed to force even upon an unwilling mind the conviction, that the promise left to the Church by the LORD and 'Chief Bishop' of the Church had not then failed her. The Reports of the Committees on Convocational Reform and Church Extension, which were appointed on the first of these Sessions, were on the second brought before the Convocation. They are temperate, practical, and earnest. But the first especially, seems to call for much sifting and discussion in the Church at large. It has now been

¹ On the motion of the Bishop of London, it was resolved, *nemine contradicente*, 'to appoint a committee of the Upper House, and to desire the Lower House to nominate seven of its members to deliberate with such committee, when summoned, to consider and report to the houses, with a view to addressing her Majesty thereon, whether any, and if so, what reforms in the constitution of Convocation were expedient, to enable it to treat with the full confidence of the Church, of such matters as her Majesty might be pleased to submit to its deliberations.' The resolution, so adopted, was submitted to the Lower House, and carried by a large majority.

A second resolution was carried in the Upper House, on the motion of the Bishop of Llandaff, with only one dissentient, 'to appoint a committee of this house, and to direct the Lower House to name seven of its members to consult with it, when summoned, to consider and report to this house whether the great increase and present condition of the population does not make some, and what adaptation of the Church's rule, needful, to meet the Church's needs.' This resolution was also carried in the Lower House. The joint committees were appointed, and the result of their deliberations have been laid before the Convocation, and also before the House of Lords.

brought before the public mind, and appears almost incumbent upon a churchman to acquire so much knowledge of the subject as to be able to judge fairly of the extent, the tendency, and the possible results of the Reforms which have been proposed.

We will suppose then that our reader feels desirous of forming some of his own opinions on the probable efficiency of Convocation in its present state, or in a reformed one; and that in order to do so he has recourse naturally to some of the Convocational writers of the period when it was in full activity. He will find it a work of controversy as a thing of course; and the enquiry will involve the perusal of some other writer on the other side of the question, probably more voluminous. Here again he will meet with unsatisfactory references to other books, some folios, some pamphlets, which he will find next to impossible to obtain: however interested in the question he at first has been, he will lose the clue to the feelings and objects of the writers, and become confused and bewildered among the chaos of theories and counter-theories, isolated facts and undeveloped principles, forms which are taken for granted as familiar to him, and practices which have for some time been obsolete; until in weariness and impatience he relinquishes the task, and is driven in mere despair to take his notions on Convocation from the common-places of the orators of the platform.

In order then to save readers on Convocation some amount, even if it be but a small one, of such labour and perplexity, we propose now to lay before them some brief critical and historical notices of our principal writers on Convocation; and while going over their works to throw what light we are able upon that rude and undigested, but yet very valuable, mass of controversial writing, which, during the reigns of William III. and Anne, formed itself round them by successive accretions, which has a style and unity of its own, and which we may therefore reasonably enough distinguish as '*Our Convocation Literature.*'

Now if the muse had ever smiled on us, and if we had been ever touched with the fire of creative genius, we might paint the fortunes of this Synodal controversy in hues of poetic brilliancy; we might celebrate its wordy warfare in the glowing life and language of another *Iliad*; we might describe its combatants skirmishing at a distance or closing hand to hand, one while hitting a foe with the heavy spear of an '*Examination*,' at another extending over a fellow-partisan the sevenfold shield of a '*Defence*;' on this side, a flight of '*Letters*' might be seen hurtling through the darkened air, and on that a warrior crushing his opponent with a '*Reply*' in the form of a folio, which to lift only would take two men, such as men now are. Hector and Achilles might find apt parallels in Gibson and in Atterbury,

and the Homeric element of occasionally prosy speeches would assuredly not be wanting. Or if our fancy were in a more sombre mood, we might imagine ourselves as guiding our reader's steps, as Virgil guided the exile of Florence, aiding his feet to find out the zigzag path through that intricate and obscure controversy.

'Noi salevam per una pietra fessa,
Che si moveva d'una e d'altra parte,
Sì come l'onda, che fugge e s'appressa.—
Qui si convien usare un poco d' arte.'

Purgatorio, canto x.

And all the while there have been flitting before us the forms of sarcasms, whose life has gone, innuendos now unintelligible, and animosities which have been long since dead; and before us lay crowded in ghostly confusion, forgotten arguments, shadowy principles and theories which have mouldered into dust; and a region opened to our view, dark indeed, and unknown in its extent, yet not without something which allured us to advance in its very vastness and obscurity—The Purgatory of Pamphlets.

The popularity which William of Holland enjoyed at the beginning of his reign had been gradually diminishing, until, after the death of Mary II., it was superseded by an almost general feeling of distrust and opposition. Many causes led to its decline; among the most obvious were the expenses of the wars in which he was engaged, his own unenglish manners, the attempts which his advisers made to revive the policy of the Stuarts and adapt it to the altered circumstances of the times, and not least perhaps, the suspicions which were entertained of the hostility of the king and his ministers to the Established Church. It was of course the object of the Tory party to foment this unpopularity by any means within their reach; and the demand of justice for the Church was one of the most obvious as well as the most specious. To many an earnest churchman this was a real motive for exertion; but to others it was only a cry, and was never intended for anything else. If we bear this in mind, it will serve as a key to many of the anomalies of policy which astonish us in the history of the Convocations of that time, where we find both the opponents and the friends of Convocational action complaining again and again, that no advantage resulted from the sessions of that assembly, either to the Church or to religion itself. It was intended that it should be so. The leading men of the day, while they were out of office, supported the claims of the Church, for the purpose of exciting a feeling against the government; and when they obtained office themselves, though they rewarded the men who had been their in-

struments, they considered it their interest to render nugatory the efforts they had seemed to make before. Here is one clue to some of the proceedings which seem so inconsistent and purposeless, and we imagine that we can perceive another in the influence, which the vacillating court at S. Germain's exerted upon the intriguing and political portion of the clergy: for all the nation intrigued; and the clergy of those days most certainly did not deserve the encomium that was passed upon that model divine, who 'never troubled any body about either politics or religion.' The Church it is true was strong; but it was the strength of fever rather than of health, which was followed by the reaction of the Georgian era: and if it was not in danger from without,—and remembering Burnet's Comprehension scheme, we can hardly say that it was not,—it was in a most divided and unhealthy state within.¹ The Bishops, with not more than two or three exceptions, had been 'judiciously chosen,' and were Whigs, and devoted to the court. The country clergy were Tories, and though not precisely what Macaulay describes them, were yet behind the working clergy of the present day in intelligence and freedom from prejudice; though they might equal them in zeal, and were certainly their superiors in influence. The dignified clergy were, upon the whole, men of a high standard of earnestness and intellectual power. These were the picked men of the Church, and were the leaders of the rest of their order: for to be 'a safe man' was not then a necessary qualification for preferment; and that combination of mediocrity of talent with moderation of sentiment, which constitutes 'the safe man's' character, was hardly then appreciated. They were 'high' in their views of the Church, though they would differ in many points from 'the high-churchman' of to-day; and if they were sufficiently zealous in defence of purity of doctrine, yet they were always too much inclined to place the temporal privileges of the Church on a par with, or even above, her spiritual power and divinely-given authority.

That element, too, which is so valuable in a church, of high principled although obstinate conscientiousness, had been lost by the secession of the non-juring clergy, though their movement had not yet assumed the character of a schism; and those of the clergy who had taken the oaths, while their feelings and their

¹ 'Some steps have been made, and large ones too, towards a Scotch Reformation, by suspending and ejecting the chief and most zealous of our bishops, and others of the higher clergy; and by advancing, upon all vacancies of sees and dignities ecclesiastical, men of notoriously Presbyterian, or, what is worse, of Erastian principles. These are the ministerial ways of undermining episcopacy; and when to the seven notorious ones shall be added more upon the approaching deprivation, they will make a majority; and then we may expect the new model of a church to be perfected.'—*Somers' Tracts*, vol. x. p. 368.

interest were still with the exiled family, were discontented with their position and restless in their aims. Their views, especially on the point which had been up to that time a fundamental of Anglicanism, 'passive submission,' were thrown into utter confusion, and they were exposed to the temptation, to which many of them succumbed, of allowing plans and contrivances of purely worldly policy to supersede in their minds the true interests of the Church and the honesty and reality of religion. The restoration of legitimate monarchy became their leading principle, rather than the advancement of the Gospel. The Whig clergy on the other hand chiefly consisted of those of the Puritan party who had conformed; but the old earnest spirit of Puritanism had died out among them, and they had taken up the establishmentarianism of the Church of England without its Catholic principles. They were eager assertors of the secular authority of the Episcopate, while they denied or doubted its apostolical institution; and their servility to a *de facto* sovereign was unadorned by the chivalrous notion of a 'Divine Right' in kings. They worshipped power; and they were shortly to be, if they were not already, known as the 'Low Church' party.¹ In the nation, while profligacy of morals was still the vice of the many, philosophical unbelief was becoming that of the few; and in the Church the anti-popery controversies of the preceding reign had been succeeded by restlessness and even recklessness of speculation on the highest mysteries of the Faith; and Sherlock, and Bury, and Locke, and Burnet—in spite of a ukase from William on the subject—rationalized upon the TRINITY, as upon any other matter of metaphysical discussion; while Woolston and Toland and a host of minor infidels assailed Christianity itself.

This was much the social and ecclesiastical aspect of 1696, when a pamphlet was published, urging most strongly the revival of synodal action in the Church as a remedy for the existing evils; and asserting by arguments from the analogy between a Parliament and a Convocation the right of the latter to exert its legal powers for the maintenance of Christian truth, and the punishment of its impugnors. This pamphlet Mr. Fraser has lately edited for the use of readers of the present day. Written with boldness, and even with violence, yet 'A Letter to a Convocation Man' does not appear to have been intended to be, what it certainly proved to be, the first shot fired in a long and hard-fought controversial campaign. It was rather an *argumentum ad homines* addressed to the patrons of representative institutions and liberty of debate; and an attempt to show that the power of the

¹ The earliest instance of the use of this term which we at present remember, is 'The Character of a Low Churchman,' 4to. 1702. By Dr. Sacheverel. After that date it is very common.

Crown, which had been resisted even to revolution when it was formerly exerted to suppress or to keep in abeyance the power of Parliament, was with very great inconsistency still exerted to suppress a deliberative assembly of equal antiquity with Parliament, and possibly in its own sphere of equal utility. This argument was put with fairness enough, and with force enough; and its legal monotony was varied with¹ allusions and covert sarcasms which did not spare the highest personage in the state. The letter was anonymous, but the writer—who was not a clergyman, for he speaks of himself as a Member of the House of Commons, and as being present at the presentation of Peter Foley as speaker, in 1694—is considered, on we think sufficient grounds, to have been Sir Bartholomew Shower, a legal writer of some eminence, although Macaulay speaks of him slightly. His pamphlet is stated to be intended as an answer to three questions—

‘I. What occasion there is at present for a Convocation? ———

‘II. What law there is that commands or prevents them sitting and acting but the absolute free pleasure of the Prince?

‘III. Of what validity their acts and resolutions are, unless confirmed and approved by Parliament?’

In treating the second of these questions, he touched upon a fact which the succeeding controversy brought into no slight prominence. It is this,—in the writ by which the bishops are summoned to Parliament, there is a clause warning them to bring their Dean and Archdeacons in person, and their Chapter and diocesan clergy by proxy to Parliament with them, ‘to consent to the things’ which should be then ordained. The writer of the letter, after quoting the writ, says no more than that it seemed to him ‘certain that the præmunition or warning ‘mentioned in this writ, being to those who are members of and ‘constitute the Lower House of Convocation, is an argument of ‘invincible strength to establish the necessity of Convocations ‘meeting as often as Parliaments.’ This inference seems fair enough: but the matter was not to rest so quietly.

William III. was annoyed by both the matter and the style of the ‘Letter to a Convocation Man,’ which had not only marked out limits for his ecclesiastical supremacy, but had even ventured an innuendo against his private religious character; and it was therefore necessary that it should be answered as quickly as possible. A pamphlet of some small merit, under the title of ‘A Letter to a Member of Parliament,’ appeared before long in reply, written by a barrister named William Wright, who was

¹ ‘And for his Majesty’s good-will, we do not, I say, we will not, in the least doubt of it: though some who would be thought to understand his mind best are pleased in all companies to admire and celebrate a prince of no religion as the best of governors: for which saucy insinuation we hope, in time, that vengeance will find them.’—*A Letter to a Convocation Man*, p. 22.

Recorder of Oxford; but the task of refuting it was assigned to Dr. Wake, who, even if it were against his inclination, undertook it with an obedience which was not likely to lose its reward. Wake was a man in every way fitted for the work, by his extensive reading, and was endued, as a controversialist, with perseverance and earnestness; yet he was unfortunate in having the post assigned to him of combating—as he really was, however, he might disguise it to himself—against the Synodal rights of the Church. He lost no time. Within a few months he published his ‘*Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods*,’ by which he intended to silence the writer of the ‘*Letter to a Convocation Man*.’ This book showed an amount of learning upon a subject which up to that time had been but little investigated, which was more than respectable, although it was hurried in its style and somewhat confused in the arrangement of its facts—faults which he himself pleads guilty to. The great point which he wishes to establish is that Convocation is an occasional assembly, meeting only by the will of the Crown, for such purposes as the Crown shall direct; and that this is what it ought to be. To prove this he goes through all the nations of the civilized world, one after the other, endeavouring to show, as a general principle, from the practice of each of them, that the sovereign alone possesses the irresponsible right of prescribing the persons who are to be called to a Synod, the time and the place of their meeting, the matter of their debates, the form in which they should conduct them, and the way of their being dissolved. This is doing too much; and the reader finds his process of induction tedious rather than conclusive. He then applies the same method to the Convocation, and limits it by the same principle. He had here to meet the universal consensus of English lawyers that the clergy formerly sat in Parliament, and afterwards were for conveniency separated into a distinct house. He allows that it was so, and gives the following account of that assembly, which, however, he does not recognise as the Convocation:—

‘When in the twenty-third year of Edward I. the constitution of the Parliament came to be settled, as now it is, the inferior Clergy were put upon the very same foot that the Commons were in it. And as with respect to the one a writ was issued out to the sheriff of each county to return a certain number of knights, citizens, and burgesses; so with relation to the other a clause was inserted into the writ of the Bishop of the Diocese, to send the Dean of his Cathedral and Archdeacons in person; and out of the Chapter and Archdeaconries, to choose such a number of Proctors as was thought sufficient to represent the Clergy of each Diocese in it. From the sixth of Edward III. the Clergy have continued to be as duly and constantly summoned to Parliament as the Commons themselves have been. Indeed, so evident is the truth of this, that our greatest lawyers and antiquaries do not deny the inferior Clergy to have been once a Member of the Parliament. . . . That upon such times as the whole Parliament met and as long as they continued to sit together, the Proctors of the Clergy met together with them, is not to be doubted.

Their writs summoned them to the same place and upon the same business; and we cannot doubt but that they met accordingly, at the opening of every Parliament together. Whether upon the decision of the two Houses, as the Bishops continued to sit with the one, so the Proctors of the Clergy did also sit at first, with the other, I am not able to say. But from the time that they had a distinct Prolocutor of their own, we must conclude that they met distinctly. And upon all the divisions we meet with, in the most ancient rolls of Parliament, the method still was for each estate to consult together, Lords Temporal by themselves, the Commons by themselves, and the Bishops and Clergy by themselves. And when we consider the method, that has been taken, from the beginning, of summoning each of these to Parliament, how the Temporal Lords have their writs particularly directed to them, the Commons theirs directed to the Sheriff of each county, and the Bishops and Clergy theirs joined together, it may seem not improbable, that as they were summoned after a distinct manner to the Parliament, so they sat too; and that the Bishops and Proctors of the Clergy not only occasionally consulted together, but ordinarily acted as one of the Three Estates of the Realm there too.'—*Authority of Christian Princes*, pp. 209—221.

But as the fact had to be accounted for that the Convocation, even if it were shown not to be as much a part of the constitution as the Parliament, which 'A Letter to a Convocation Man,' had maintained it to be, yet was by ancient custom summoned together with Parliament, Wake cut through the difficulty by asserting that the chief end for which the clergy was assembled by the Crown was to obtain money from them. At the same time he admits that if the Crown should persist in refusing the Clergy the liberty of assembling when the state of the Church required it, then the Bishops and the Clergy should set both law and power on one side, and discharge those higher duties which the necessities of the Church imposed upon them. There was, however, through the whole book such an obvious spirit of subservience to the Court party, and passages in it are marked by such an obtrusion of the absolute power of the Crown in spirituals, such hard language, and such a tone of objugation towards the Clergy in general, and especially towards those who might be conceived to be opposed to his views, that it could not but be expected but that an opponent, whenever he might arise, would seize such a convenient handle for raising a prejudice against the book, and for stigmatizing its principles as slavish and unconstitutional; and Wake himself¹ seems to have had some reason for expecting its condemnation by both the House of Commons and the Lower House of Convocation.

Before the year was out, one part of the argument of the 'Authority of Christian Princes' was replied to in 'Municipium'

¹ He writes, Jan. 23, 1701 :—'Once it was seriously, I believe, resolved to have had me censured in both Houses of Commons Spiritual and Temporal.'—*Nicolson's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 217.

² 'Municipium Ecclesiasticum; or, the Rights, Liberties, and Authorities of the Christian Church asserted against all Oppressive Doctrines and Constitutions, occasioned by Dr. Wake's Book.' 8vo. 1697.

Ecclesiasticum, or the Rights, Liberties, and Authorities of the Christian Church asserted, by Samuel Hill, Rector of Kilming-ton. He does not meddle with the English law, or mark out the place which Convocation occupies in our constitution; but deals chiefly with the general government of the Christian Church. He maintains the divine right of Synods in general, and asserts their rights as still existing under the supremacy of the civil power; and after a history of the Synods and Councils in the early Church, he rests the whole argument upon the inherent and inalienable power of the Catholic Church. Hill's book is dull in style, and has never been popular; yet it displays a good share of careful reading and research into early ecclesiastical history.

In answer to this Wake put forth, in 1698, '*An Appeal*' to all True Members of the Church of England in behalf of the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy—a dry string of documents on the subject of the supremacy, and of quotations collected from various authors, ranging from the Act of Submission to the time of Charles II. This publication attracted no attention, even in Wake's own time. It is sufficiently conclusive and sufficiently unreadable. Yet such an attack as this in the dedication was almost certain to raise up enemies enough to its author:—

'A new sort of disciplinarians are risen up from within ourselves, who seem to comply with the Government of the Church much upon the same account that others do with that of the State, not out of conscience to their duty, or any love they have for it; but because it is the Established Church, and they cannot keep their preferments without it. They hate our Constitution and revile all such as stand up in good earnest for it; but for all that they resolve to hold fast to it, and go on still to subscribe and rail.'

His triumph, however, was but a short one. The avenger of blood was behind him. Scarcely two years elapsed before Atterbury brought out the most striking work in the whole controversy in answer to Wake. The first edition of '*The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation,*' appeared in 1700. Atterbury had a real genius for polemics; his natural powers were strengthened by previous experience in controversy, and he knew that he could rely upon a very large amount of popular sympathy, while his courage would be only excited by the risk which would accompany an attempt to impugn the

¹ '*An Appeal to all true Members of the Church of England in behalf of the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy,*' by W. Wake, D.D. 8vo. 1698. This Hill replied to in '*The Rights of the Christian Claim,*' further defended in *Answer to the Appeal of Dr. Wake,* by Sam. Hill. 8vo. 1698.

Two other publications which appeared about this time were—'*A Brief Inquiry into the Ground, Authority, and Rights of Ecclesiastical Synods, upon the principles of Scripture and right Reason,*' occasioned by a late Book, entitled *Municipium Ecclesiasticum.*' 8vo. 1699. And '*Some Thoughts on a Convocation, and the Notion of Divine Right.*' 4to. 1699.

policy of the Government towards the Church. Wake then found an antagonist in the champion of the High Church party, whom it was no mean thing to encounter—

‘Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer.’

The theory which Atterbury was desirous of establishing was that the Convocation was summoned to assemble, primarily if not solely, by the Crown writs, which were sent to each individual Bishop, and not by the Archbishops' mandates, which he looked upon as a mere formal addition. He traced the history of these Crown writs, or rather that peculiar clause in them, which commences with the word *Præmunientes*, down from the time of Edward I.; and by documents and writs collected with the greatest industry and arranged with the greatest art,¹ for which his opponents insinuated he was indebted to others. He laboured to prove that the Convocation is a necessary part of the Parliament, and one of the estates of the realm. And from these principles he endeavoured to deduce the practical conclusions, that the Convocation ought, as a matter of right, to sit for the transaction of business, along with, and as often as, the Lords and Commons; that all measures regarding the Church ought to begin in Convocation as regularly and invariably as money-bills begin in the Commons, and that the Church had need of the Convocation, because she had a right to it. He himself states the propositions which his book was intended to demonstrate as follows:—

‘I affirm and have proved, that the Convocation has a right not only to be summoned, but to meet with every new Parliament, and to be opened in due form by Divine Service and a Sermon. That the Clergy of the Lower House, when thus met, have a right of filling the chair of it with a Prolocutor, and of being put into a condition of doing business. That if they have any requests, any motions to make to my Lords the Bishops, the King, or his great Council, for the good of religion, or the redress of Church grievances, they have a right to make them; to enter into what debates, and come to what resolutions they shall think fit, within their proper sphere, without being obliged to qualify themselves for such debates or resolutions by a Royal licence, which is necessary to no Synodical act, previous to that of making or enacting a Canon. That in these respects and to these purposes, the Convocation is still a Parliamentary body, and an essential part of our constitution, called both by the clause in the Bishops' summons, and by writs directed to the Archbishop of either Province, which clause and which writs, whenever a new Parliament is to meet, can no more by the rules of our Constitution be omitted, than the writs for the Lords and Commons can. In short, that not only the King

¹ Nicolson says in a letter of Ap. 11. 1700:—‘The materials of this learned piece were, I am told, prepared by Dr. Hutton, of Aynhoe, but they were put together by a pert gentleman of Christ Church, who has shown himself to have a much greater share of wit than logic.’—*Nicolson's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 174.

Again, Ap. 18,—‘An insolent bungling and illogical compiler; for it is most apparent that the antiquary and the jack-pudding are two several persons.’—P. 176.

has a right of thus calling the Clergy to attend, but the Clergy also have a right of attending, and the Lords and Commons a right of being attended by them.'—*Rights, Powers, and Privileges*, p. 503.

And then he concludes his book with an epinician apostrophe to Wake—

'This is the doctrine, briefly laid down in that letter, which first gave rise to this debate; and is, in these papers more fully explained and proved. If Dr. Wake can show wherein any part of it disagrees with the laws and usages of this kingdom let him do it: if he cannot,—as I am certain he cannot—he is obliged by his own proposal to submit, that is to own himself utterly mistaken throughout this dispute, and publicly to retract his illegal and slavish opinions.'—P. 504.

He also analyses the Act of Submission, by which the Clergy had been fettered by Henry VIII., with an amount of legal acumen which is surprising in one who had not made the law his study; and in addition to his general subject elucidates by the way many obscure parts of our ecclesiastical history and government. The subject, apart from its importance, would seem to be unattractive enough, yet Atterbury contrives to relieve its inherent dryness by the vigour and piquancy of his style. At one time he indulges in a tirade on the principles of constitutional liberty with a mimicry which must have been rather provoking to the Whigs of the day; at another he deals out the most unsparing blows to his opponents. Not Wake only, but Archdeacon Nicolson and Bishop Burnet each come in for their share; and he varies his manner according to the man he is dealing with. Charity is not his strong point evidently. Burnet he treats with ironical deference; Nicolson with a contempt which is almost good-humoured; and Wake with a sneer, and sarcasm, and invective, lavished in succession with no unsparing hand. This must have told immensely in Atterbury's own day, for the reader now can, after more than a century and a half, hardly choose but laugh at the hits which he gives so sharply and so heartily.

The book was known to be Atterbury's, though it appeared without his name, and was received with a general welcome by the High-Church Clergy. Atterbury was rewarded by his University with the Doctorate, and Convocation was summoned to meet again in 1701 mainly in consequence of his exertions. Yet the publication was not without danger at the time. Writing to Bishop Trelawney, whose chaplain he was, Nov. 12, 1700-1, he tells him—

'Last week the Judges were called together, and my Lord Chief Justice Holt with earnestness proposed to them a declaration of the sense of the submission act in opposition to what I have written; and a censure of the book as intrenching on the King's prerogative. The proposal stuck with them. Some of them had not seen the book, others had not read it, and

all required time; and so the matter stands at present. He proposed it, as I understand, with an intimation as if such a declaration and answer would not be unwelcome to the king.

He seems to have set but little store by the literary attacks which he anticipated. Writing to Mr. Newey, Jan. 18, 1700-1, he says—

‘When you come to town, you will be entertained with answers of all sorts to my book. Dr. Hody has one just upon the point of coming out in two thick octavo volumes of about seventy sheets of paper, which he calls ‘A History of Convocations.’ Another gentleman has, by order, wrote and printed a good part of another. It is to be of about two or three hundred pages; and is to be a first part only, two more being to follow. And this gentleman is ordered to use me rudely, and to put as much gall as he can into his ink. Dr. Hody is to be in the meek way. The design of both is, to open Convocation with a clamour against the book, just at the very nick of its meeting; so that I shall not be able to answer. After all, Dr. Wake is to come, when the Convocation is up, with a mighty folio. Under all this threatening news I thank God I am in heart.’—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. pp. 53, 65—67.

The first writer who took the field against him was Burnet. On June 29, in the same year, he published some ‘Reflections’¹ on Atterbury's work, chiefly in vindication of his own History of the Reformation, though he also states his own views concerning the nature of a Convocation, and the relations which the Presbyterate bears to the Episcopate when they are assembled in Synod. He defends the policy of William toward the Clergy, supposes that Atterbury had not owned his book for fear of ‘engaging past retreat,’ and in choice railing language, choice that is for a Bishop, he abuses his opponent for his abusive style.

Kennet was the next. His ‘Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations’ was but the first part of a much larger work, of which three parts were originally contemplated, and in which he purposed to attack Hill as well as Atterbury, and to refute the *Jus Divinum* of Synods which the former had so strongly advocated. The two latter parts never appeared, but the one we have forms an almost complete work, and displays much research and well-digested knowledge on the subject of Convocations. He was Atterbury's equal in bitterness, but not in wit; and the value of the book is lessened to a modern reader by his constant efforts to attack some proposition that Atterbury had not advanced, or to abuse him personally. But notwithstanding these drawbacks it is indispensable to the

¹ ‘Reflections on a book entitled the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, by Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum.’ 4to. 1700.

In the beginning of the next year appeared a ‘Letter to a Convocation Man, from a Clergyman in the country.’ Signed W. B., Jan. 1700. This was written by Dr. Binckes, and appears to have been sometimes confounded with the first ‘Letter to a Convocation Man,’ from which it differs in both matter and style.

Convocational student, because it distinguishes with considerable plainness and care the two elements of which our Convocations have been formed, which it was Atterbury's object to confound as much as possible. The latter wished to make Convocation altogether parliamentary in its origin, that he might make it so also in its practice; but Kennet takes a counter view, and shows that it is in its nature as well as its formation, an assembly combining two distinct principles. His theory is, that the Convocation which we now have arose from an amalgamation of the old Parliamentary Convocation, which was summoned by the Crown in both the Archbishops' writs and the Bishops,' and which was chiefly convoked by the King for the purpose of raising subsidies from the Clergy, and of the pure Ecclesiastical Synod which met by inherent Church authority at the mandate of the Archbishop, and was to be engaged in framing canons and regulating the spiritual affairs of the Church. He considered the present Convocation in either of these lights according to the nature of the business before it. He doubted whether the Convocation could be considered as a Synod until it had received the Royal licence for entering upon ecclesiastical business; and he maintained that as far as it is a Synod it could not be regarded as a necessary part of our constitution; but only as it was a Parliamentary Convocation called in obedience to both the Bishops' and the Archbishops' writs.

We may sum up our criticism on Kennet by saying that his principles upon the whole are fairly stated, though his tone of writing¹ is most virulent. He followed up the subject in an 'Occasional Letter;' but he gained no popularity by his work, in which he was generally considered to have betrayed the cause of the Clergy, and to have become an Iscariot to his order.

A pamphlet² written against Atterbury, and pointing out some of his, perhaps, wilful errors, with both clearness and force, was followed by some very clever 'Remarks on the Temper of the Writers about Convocations'³ by Dr. Smalridge, which professed to be written by a country squire, and quizzed Wake

¹ Atterbury says,—'It is full of scurrility and bitter railing. When your Lordship (Trelawney) sees it you will find it the most consummate piece of impudence that has appeared in the world for many years. But being impudence on the right side, it will be not only accepted but applauded.' It is near four hundred pages, and is but one part of several that are to follow.—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 74.

² 'An Occasional Letter on the subject of English Convocations, by the author of Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations.' 8vo. 1701.

³ 'Mr. Atterbury's Arguments for the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation considered.' 4to. 1701.

⁴ 'The principles of Mr. Atterbury's book,' by Dr. B. West, Chaplain to Bp. Barnet.

⁵ 'Some Remarks on the Temper of the late Writers about Convocations, particularly Dr. Wake, Dr. Kennet, and the author of Mr. A.'s principles.' 4to. 1701.

and Kennet, and especially the latter, with a great deal of genial good-humour. There is not much in it, but it is really refreshing to the parched reader, like an oasis in the dry and ugly desert of the controversy.

The publications which have so far come before us, treat of Convocation, so to speak, *ab extra*; they discuss the theory of it, the origin of its two houses, and its *status* in our constitution; and as they were the first in order of time, so they may be arranged as one separate series among the works of our Convocational authors. But in order that we may take in the whole group of these writers at a glance, it will be necessary to add to our list one or two more works, which appeared at a later period in the controversy. These are Hody's 'History of English Councils and Convocations,' and Wake's 'State of the Church and the Clergy of England.' Nicolson,¹ also defended himself against Atterbury with perhaps more warmth than discretion. The 'Synodus Anglicana,' which at first sight seems as if it ought to be included in this class, really belongs to the second stage, when the controversy was chiefly practical, and related to the internal structure of Convocation, and the separate powers, and the mutual relations of the two houses between themselves.

Hody's book was published in 1701. He writes calmly, like a man who weighed his statements well before he committed them to the world, because he knew that they would not escape without a thorough examination. He is correct in his facts, and seldom ventures to theorize beyond them. He recapitulates a good deal of Kennet's matter, and in a great degree adopts his view of the origin and development of Convocation. His 'History of English Councils' is useful, though it is unattractive.

We cannot suppose that Wake, though his 'Authority of Christian Princes'² had been defended against Hill, with his consciousness of learning, and his unflagging industry, could rest silent after the provocation he had received from Atterbury. That prodigious mountain of information which he, together with Nicolson, Gibson, and Tanner, had been amassing, was for three years in labour, but then it brought forth another mountain worthy of its parent. A folio of 520 pages, with an appendix of 250 more, was the gigantic missile which he hurled, like one of Milton's angry angels, at the devoted head of his arch-adversary Atterbury. 'The State of the Church

¹ 'A Letter to the Rev. White Kennet, D.D. in defence of the English Historical Library against the unmannerly and slanderous objections of Mr. F. Atterbury, in his new theory of Convocation.' By W. Nicolson, Archdeacon of Carlisle. 1702.

² 'A Vindication of the Authority of Christian Princes from the Exceptions made against it by Mr. Hill,' &c. 1701.

and the Clergy of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, and Conventions' first saw the light in 1703. In it he exhausted the question. For those who have read it, it is conclusive in every sense of the word. He examines every statement of Atterbury's, he refutes each of his assertions, he corrects his minutest errors with triumphant self-gratulation, he cuts off all chance of retreat, and renders an answer almost a physical as well as a logical impossibility. For what mortal could write a reply to well nigh 800 folio pages?

Wake opens his tremendous battery, after vindicating his own principles, by dividing and distinguishing the various kinds of Ecclesiastical assemblies. He reckons them as four in number, and he gives a full account and history of each. I. The Parliamentary Conventions, which consisted of the Proctors who were returned in obedience to the *Præmunientes* writ, and were strictly members of the House of Commons; this assembly invariably sat at the same time with the Parliament. II. The Provincial Convocations, which were summoned by the Archbishop, and usually for the purpose of obtaining subsidies from the Clergy on that account. These often, though not necessarily, met concurrently with the Parliament; though on this point Wake expresses himself confusedly. III. The Diocesan Synods; and IV. The Provincial Councils, which had no connexion at all with the Parliament, and consisted only of the Episcopal Order; these last he considers to be the true Church Synod. These different assemblies he traces out at the greatest length, from the times of the Saxon kings, in treating of which period Nicolson especially assisted him, through the reigns of every English Sovereign down to his own King William III.; leaving, as we may well believe, no one authority uncited, no one precedent unmentioned: and yet when the student 'with difficulty and labour hard' has struggled through the enormous tome, and that perhaps, not once only, he finds to his disappointment that he has obtained no clear and comprehensive view of the subject; the facts are too numerous for any induction to grasp them, and the author himself is embarrassed by the very stores he has accumulated. The critical remark is a just one,—'That if the truth be with Wake, yet the appearance of it is with Atterbury.'

He draws, it is true, the distinctions between these several Assemblies pointedly and sharply; but they were not so clearly defined in reality. An assembly of the clergy, however brought together, we know by history, very often acted in several capacities. Wake says that the nature of the assembly changed in accordance with the business it was engaged upon. It might have been so; but we have often only his *à priori* ideas of consistency to ground the supposition upon. The fact, we

believe, was, that the Clergy of those days were extremely unwilling to meet from various reasons, of which economy is a likely one, and there was considerable difficulty in bringing them together; but that when they were once got to meet, whether by the King, the Archbishop, or the Papal Legate, the plan was to get as much work out of them—and as much money too—as could conveniently be secured in any shape whatever. Again, we imagine, that the Archbishop, or the King, on account of this aversion of the clergy to the trouble and expense of meeting, often as a matter of convenience only summoned those whose presence was indispensable to the business they had in hand.

The Clergy at that time did not claim attendance at these Assemblies as a right, but rather deprecated it as a burden, or resisted it as an exertion of unjustifiable power. And, therefore, even the very facts, which are so necessary to a constitutional argument, stubbornly refuse to run evenly together, and to submit quietly to the harness of a self-consistent theory. It was with Convocation as with Parliament: and the readers of Sir Francis Palgrave need to be reminded of the unwillingness of burgesses to elect and the ancient freeholders to be sent as representatives to Parliament.

We may be accused in these strictures of not having properly mastered the argument of Wake's folio; and perhaps we have not. But all we shall attempt to do in our own defence is, to bid those who think we have not done it justice, to read it for themselves. So far the particulars of the controversy have seemed no doubt to the reader dry enough; yet it is not utterly without its more amusing points.

These doughty combatants were not altogether wanting in a certain style of wit. Their jocularities indeed could scarcely be characterised as 'Attic salt;' it was more like that water which the beleaguered Spartans dug for on the shore of Sphacteria, and offered to each other to drink rile and bitter, *ὄλον εἰκός*. But as the idea of *Facetiæ Synodicæ*, or Convocational 'Ana,' may perhaps be quite a new one to our readers, we may as well call a halt here, and cull some which seem readiest to hand. Atterbury shall come first:—

'Those little shifting equivocal forms of speech he is so full of, those savings and softenings he throws in everywhere, show that the thistles he was mumbling did not pass easily; and that he had not only no assurance that he was in the right, but a shrewd guess that he was in the wrong; and laid in matter therefore for evasion against he should have need of it.'

—*Preface to the Rights*, p. xii.

Again,—

'Had I wished him ill, yet I would never have taken this way of expressing it: for Petavius has taught me long ago, that to write against

some men is the way only to have their pensions doubled. And the experience of later times than his has showed, that it is possible to write a man out of reputation into preferment. Much less can I be suspected to have engaged in this design out of interest. The way to that is not by appearing in behalf of Councils, which, as Johannes Major well observed, meet but seldom, and have no dignities to dispose of.—*Preface to Rights*, p. xxiii.

‘He produces two or three stories which I have shown to be utterly wide of the mark; and then concludes: “So entirely has the assembling of these Provincial Synods been looked upon to depend on the will and authority of the Christian Prince!” A conclusion that has no premises, nor any one clear and full instance in all his long bead-roll of Councils to support it.’

‘The Doctor had kindly prepared us in his preface to expect digressions; but withal promised in his nice manner that they should be “rather not directly to the purpose than altogether distant from it.” However, I find not that he has kept his word with us, or that they deserve to be thus gently dwelt with. In the first of them that meets me here, I have shown nine parts in ten of it, *i. e.* whatever he has said about general Councils, to be altogether distant from the purpose; and that other poor scantling about Provincial Synods, which seems to be, yet is really not to the purpose; and I conclude, therefore, that the whole is not only, not directly to the purpose, but altogether distant from it. The Doctor must forgive me, if I tell him that these historical unedifying accounts of his put me in mind of the honest confession of William Caxton, the chronicler, the words of which well became Dr. Wake’s mouth as well every whit as they did his; and I cannot help thinking that I hear him at the close of his first chapter thus addressing himself to his reader:—

“If I cowde,” says he, “have founde moo storyes, I wolde have sette in it moo; but the substaunce that I can fynde and knowe I have shortly sette theyn in this boke; prayeigne all theym that see this symple werke of myne to pardone me of my symple writynge.”

‘And, indeed, I, for my part, should have been very ready to-do so, had it been as harmless as it is simple; and were it not likely, as simple as it is, to be produced hereafter for a testimony against the Church’s Rights, if it be not now opposed and disowned. For which reason, how simple soever the performance is, it deserves to be examined.’—*Atterbury’s Rights, &c.*, pp. 152, 153.

After attacking the ‘Letter to a Member of Parliament’—

‘Dr. Wake, I remember, has an axiom “that logic is one thing and law another,” which by-the-bye is all that he knows of either; and I must needs say, that I never in my life met with a better instance of the truth of that axiom than in this gentleman’s law reasonings.’—*Rights*, p. 259.

He again has a hit at Wake—

‘He has seen a journal, it seems, where there are no memorandums of anything done, and from that rough journal one would think that he had learnt all his skill in the business of Convocations. But had not something else been as empty as that journal, he would sure have foreborne giving this as an instance how Convocations have been employed.’—*Rights*, p. 288.

The gravity with which Wake receives this is something inimitable:—

‘Whatever Dr. A. thinks of Dr. W. or his skill, yet for some of his friends’ sake I would not have him speak too contemptibly of that empty journal. It was Mr. Munday’s journal of the proceedings of the Lower House which I referred to. . . . “But had not something else,” (he means

Dr. Wake's head,) "been as empty as that journal," . . . I accept his compliment; and only beg leave to inform him, that in quoting of this Convocation in the last place, I quoted the last Convocation that was granted as a subsidy to the King.—*The State of the Church*, p. 525.

A little farther on—

'The Doctor pities poor Godolphin for depending on Sir E. Coke, in a matter of antiquity; the letter-writer brings this very Godolphin to confirm Sir E. Coke's opinion in a point of law; so little are they agreed upon the character and credit of their witnesses! Poor as he is, Doctor Wake, it seems, has a friend yet poorer than he, who would not else have vouchsafed to borrow from him. But why poor Godolphin? He was as rich in learning as his little gleanings could make him, a collector, and a scribbler: and how then comes Dr. Wake to despise him? Methinks we second-hand writers should learn to speak more respectfully of one another; because, if we ourselves do not, it is probable nobody else will.'—*Rights*, p. 456.

Burnet, too, comes in for some rather clever satire—first on his country,—

'The liberty Dr. Wake has taken in his censures, is, considering his present rank in the Church, a little too early; nor will the pattern he follows in it justify him. My Lord of Sarum, indeed, may freely have taxed the vices of the Clergy, even in books where he was defending the Orders of the Church of England, or the truth of the Christian Religion. His high station is his warrant for whatever he has done of this kind lately, and a bar to all manner of reply. And his former reprehensions, should they have been somewhat too free, are capable of this excuse, that being a stranger, he might not then have thoroughly acquainted himself with the state of our Church or the characters of its members; and if he saw faults in them it was not to be expected that he should conceal them with the same tenderness, as if he had had his birth and education among them.'—*Atterbury's Preface*, p. xvii.

Again, William III. suffers, and Burnet with him:—

'William the Conqueror is another of the pious patterns he recommends, who would suffer nothing, he says, to be determined in any Ecclesiastical causes, without leave and authority from him. . . . His present Majesty is not William the Conqueror, and can no more, by our Constitution, rule absolutely, either in Church or State, than he would, even if he could. His will and pleasure is indeed a law to all his subjects, not in a conquering sense, but because his will and pleasure is only that the laws of our country should be obeyed, which he came over on purpose to rescue, and counts it his great prerogative to maintain, and contemns therefore, I doubt not, such sordid flattery as would measure the extent of his supremacy from the Conqueror's claim.

'Intimations of this kind have been thought so heinous as to be purged only by fire, a punishment which our gentle laws, though they have taken it off from men, have still reserved for books, and applied it now and then to repress a state heresie, and secure the fundamentals of our Constitution against all its undermining.'—*Rights*, pp. 158—160.

In order to fully appreciate the allusion to purgation by fire in this extract, the reader must remember that Burnet's 'Pastoral Letter' had been condemned to be burnt by the common hangman in January 1693, by the order of the House of Commons, because the Bishop in it had based the title of William of Holland to the Crown of England upon the right of conquest.

This, not unnaturally, gave great offence to the English nation. However Burnet tries to take it with a smile:—

‘He writes with just and due respect of the King, and of the present Constitution. This has come so seldom from that corner that it ought to be the more considered. I will not give that scope to jealousy as to suspect that this was an artifice, but accept its sincerity.’—*Reflections*, p. 4.

Kennet can hardly be called witty:—

‘When Mr. A. has “thankfully accepted this hint from Mr. Selden, he desires thus to improve it.” Indeed, a story at second-hand is seldom told without improvement. But then such improvements commonly deserve another name.’—*Ecclesiastical Synods*, p. 235.

But the following quiz by Smalridge upon his style and his dedication certainly is:—

‘For what else can he mean by this dedication, which, when rightly explained, runs naturally in this form,—May it please your Grace, Mr. A. has lately forced a dedication upon you, which savours too much of presumption or design. He has presumed to surprise you with an unexpected address, and appears very indecently before your Grace, because he has taken no care to express upon this subject a due respect and reverence to the Governors in Church and State, such as is suitable to the Christian religion, and his particular function. The reports and authorities in his books are the fruits of other men’s collections, not the immediate effects of his own searches into registers and records. He imperiously summons your Grace, and my Lords the Bishops, to an immediate compliance, upon pain of being pronounced the betrayers of the Church. This, my Lord, is the character of the person I set up against. But as for me, I am quite another sort of man, I am very well bred, a great antiquary, beholding to nobody; “some wits and merry folks call me a tool and a plaything.” (Pref. 8.) But I assure your Grace, that what freedom soever I may have taken in showing the vices of the inferior Clergy, (Pp. 77, 183) and “in reflecting upon the ambitious designs of dignified Presbyters” (196); yet “I am, however, tender and dutiful in treating the Governors of our Church.” (78.) Especially “those of them who are of the Ecclesiastical commission for preferments.” (311.) I have a very great respect and reverence for every body that will give me anything; and how resolute soever Mr. A. may be, your Grace may do what you please, with

‘Your Grace’s most humble and obedient Servant,

‘WHITE KENNET.’

‘One who observes how many good words this author has here bestowed upon himself, and how few upon his Patrons, would be tempted to think that the Archbishop was here dedicating to Dr. Kennet, and not the Doctor to his Grace. Long panegyrics upon a man’s self are always nauseous; but they are somewhat more unpardonable in this author, who, to show his judgment, has chosen so scurvy a subject to commend, when he had so eminent a one before him, upon which he might in justice, and ought in decency to have enlarged. He might, perhaps be encouraged to use this method by Dr. Wake’s example, but he should have remembered the Fable, and have considered that the same freedoms are not alike proper to be taken by all creatures.’—*Remarks on the Temper of Writers on Convocation*.

The Convocation¹ had met on February 10th, 1701, for some

¹ ‘A true and exact list of the members of both Houses of this present Convocation summoned to meet the 6th Feb. 1700, in the Chapter House of S. Paul’s,’ was published March 4, 1701

few sessions; and the dispute between the Bishops and the Inferior Clergy became a prominent topic, and was the occasion of much writing and printing. The privileges of the two Houses, the forms of their intercourse, and the nature of their mutual relations were themes upon which indefatigable antiquaries and excited controversialists might argue to any conceivable extent. Directly a paper on the side of the Upper House came out, it was replied to by a defender of the rights of the Lower, and this in turn was answered by some eager advocate of the opposite cause. One pamphlet produced another, and this again a third; so that the history of this part of our Convocation Literature—which seems to fall naturally enough into a series or group of its own—will read something like a literary genealogy,

ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοις,
Ἰππόνικος Καλλίου, καὶ Ἰππόνικου Καλλίας.

Atterbury, who had published a second and corrected edition of his 'Rights, Powers, and Privileges,' with his name, just before the Convocation met, and to whom the Clergy might justly be considered indebted for its meeting at all, as might be expected, took a leading part in all this. His object at first was to maintain, in accordance with the theory of his book, that those proctors only who had been returned upon the *Præmunientes* clause,¹ as some had been, were properly members of Convocation. But the principle which his party were most desirous of establishing was, that the Lower House were 'the Spiritual Commons of the Realm,' and that their rights and forms of proceeding were to be modelled upon those of the Temporal Commons. In order to bring the question to an issue, and to vindicate their own right to do business independently of the Upper House, they proceeded to hold separate sessions of their own, after they had been prorogued by the Archbishop's schedule on the 25th February: at the same time they claimed to be prorogued only by their own Prolocutor, and not by the President.

The Sessions of the whole Convocation were but few; and a complaint respecting Toland's 'Christianity not Mysterious,' and a representation against Burnet's 'Exposition of the thirty-nine Articles,' were the only noticeable transactions.

A new writer now appeared in the controversy. Edmund Gibson, chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and not at that time a member of the Convocation, undertook to refute the claims of the Lower House. His 'Letter to a friend in the country

¹ Bishop Sprat writes to Bishop Trelawney, Jan. 14, 1701:—'My Lord of London and I have summoned our Clergy by our parliament writ, according to the clause *Præmunientes*, as well as by the Convocation writ: we doubt not but your Lordship will do the like.'—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 63.

concerning the proceedings of this present Convocation' was written with a thorough freedom from the usual acerbity of controversy. It displayed a tone of candour, and a studied moderation of style, which his opponents ridiculed, as if he had intended to put himself forward as the model controversialist. Gibson had much learning and much perseverance; and the theory of Convocation which he upheld, and which he afterwards worked out at greater length, was, that the Convocation is a true and proper ecclesiastical Synod, and that all the precedents which exist prove that in all cases it is, and has been, governed by the laws which regulate Church Synods in the Church Catholic. Atterbury replied to Gibson in 'The Power of the Lower House of Convocation to adjourn itself,' and insisted strongly on the parliamentary origin of Convocation, and the analogy arising from it:—

'It is true, we are told, that there is no arguing from "a parity in constitution between a Parliament and a Convocation." I grant there is not in all cases; but surely in some there is: and particularly, wherever the constitution of one is known to be derived from, and adapted to that of the other; as the case is in respect of the division of the Convocation into two Houses. This particular frame of an English Synod was doubtlessly taken from the model of an English Parliament: because no Synods in the world but English ones are so constituted. And therefore the argument from parity of constitution must thus far be allowed to hold; that since the distinction of the Convocation into two Houses was borrowed from the Parliament, those Houses must be truly and properly such in the Parliamentary sense of the term. Not that the two Houses of Convocation must needs upon this bottom, have exactly the same rights and privileges with those of Parliament; in this there may be a great variety: but all those rights and privileges that are absolutely and indispensably necessary to the being of a House, in the parliamentary sense of the word, they must have by virtue of their origin and alliance. And these can be no fewer, I have said, than the rights of separate debates, of a negative, and of adjournment.'—*The Power of the Lower House*, p. 2.

In addition to this answer a reply to Gibson was drawn up by the order of the Lower House itself, although it was not published by its authority, under the title of 'A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation.' The preface to this was written by Aldrich and Delaune, and the narrative itself was put together by Dr. Hooper, then Dean of Canterbury and Prolocutor. In 'The Right to the Archbishop to continue the whole Convocation,' Gibson met these two pamphlets with his usual temperateness of manner and fulness of research. The principle he lays down is, that the Upper and Lower House in reality are only one Synod or Convocation, of which the Archbishop is the president, and has the entire control. This pamphlet was replied to by Hooper in 'The Narrative of the Town House Vindicated,' and 'The Vindication of the Narrative continued;' and Gibson defended himself in 'A Summary of the Arguments for the Archbishop's Right.'

Before the expiration of the year, a new Convocation was to be called together, and the election of the members excited no small attention.¹ An attempt was again made to get the Parliament writ more generally executed, and thus to give the Convocation a more thoroughly parliamentary character. In 'The Case of the Præmunientes considered' Dr. Kennet entered into the history, and argued the question of the writs with considerable clearness, and did much towards setting it at rest, by proving that, whatever might be the power of the *Præmunientes* writ, and the intention of the Constitution in retaining it, the Proctors of the Clergy, and the other members of the Convocation, were, and always had been, returned in obedience to the mandate of the Archbishop, and in accordance with the Royal writ which had been directed to him. The Lower House, however, did altogether relinquish their claim to be summoned by the Parliament writ in conjunction at least with the other.

Before the Convocation met an attempt was made at a compromise, on terms which seemed then no doubt more advantageous to the Upper House than they do now. 'An Expedient proposed,'² was written by Binckes, partly in reply to Gibson's argument in 'The Right of the Archbishop,' and partly with a view to marking out some principles on which mutual concessions

¹ The following are the pamphlets on this question, of which the first two and sixth are by Atterbury, and the fourth, fifth and last by Dr. Trimnell:—

'A Letter to a Clergyman in the country, concerning the choice of members and the execution of the Parliament Writ for the ensuing Convocation.' Nov. 17, 1701.

'A second Letter to a Clergyman in the country about the execution of the Parliament Writ for the ensuing Convocation.' Dec. 10, 1701.

'The Case of the Præmunientes considered, in answer to the Letter concerning the choice of members and the execution of the Parliament Writ for the ensuing Convocation.' 1701.

'The late Pretence of a Constant Practice to enter the Parliament as well as the Provincial Writ in the front of the Acts of every Synod, considered in a Letter to the author of the Assertion.' Dec. 11, 1701.

'The late Pretence of a Constant Practice, &c. further considered and disproved in a second Letter.' Dec. 16, 1701.

'A third Letter to a Clergyman in the country, &c. in defence of the two former.' Jan. 8, 1702.

'An Answer to a third Letter to a Clergyman in the country, &c.' March 6, 1702.

Other publications, chiefly by Atterbury, were these—

'A Letter to a Clergy-Man in the city, concerning the Instructions given to the Proctors for the Diocese of Worcester.' 4to. Jan. 26, 1702.

'A faithful Account of some Transactions in the three last Sessions of the present Convocation.' 4to. Feb. 14th, 1701. Numb. 1.

'A faithful Account of what passed in Convocation.' 4to. Feb. 19. Numb. 2.

'A true Copy of the Arch-Bishop's Speech in Jerusalem Chamber, on Thursday, Feb. 19, 1701.' 4to. 1701.

'A Continuation of the faithful Account of what passed in Convocation. 4to. March 7, 1702. Numb. 3.

² 'An Expedient proposed, or the occasions of the late Controversy in Convocation considered, and a method of adjournment pointed out consistent with the claims of both Houses, in a Letter to the author of a late book, intituled, The Right of the Archbishop, by a Country Divine.' Dec. 30, 1701.

might perhaps be arranged between the two Houses. He thus states the grounds of the dispute, and the complaints of the Lower Clergy:—

‘And now you have a full view of the true causes and occasions of the late controversy in Convocation, which, though they may have branched themselves into several particulars, yet they all sprang from the same root, and are, owing to the suspicion and jealousy, which the inferior Clergy have laboured under, for some years together, that their constitution, as to Convocations, is at stake; and this they impute to the contrivance of some persons, who do not mean well to the Established Church, and are afraid a Convocation would not only discover, but expose their designs.

‘From what has been said, it very evidently appears that the occasions of the present controversy are chiefly these.—I. Such an unusual discontinuance of Convocational Meetings, though the Clergy have been called by the Royal Writ, as is not to be met with throughout the course of many ages; there being scarce any precedent, except in the extraordinary case of the Oxford Parliament in 1681, of a Prolocutor not being chosen. II. The unprecedented method of adjourning which the Upper House thought fit to begin the first Session with, by sending a commissary to adjourn the Lower House in the presence of the Prolocutor, and this, seconded by the Registrar being sent soon after to do the like. This way of adjourning is never to be met with throughout the books, and was taken up by an accidental mistake very lately. III. The two motions sent by the Upper House to the Lower concerning their putting a stop to all business upon the receipt of a schedule from the Archbishop, and requiring their attendance at the Jerusalem Chamber, before they met in their House, very plainly appeared to be a ready way to make all meetings and consultations of the Lower House to be precarious, and to depend entirely upon the pleasure of the Archbishop. IV. That which made it right for the Lower House to assert a right of meeting upon intermediate days—for the which they have precedents—was an adjournment of a month; which, while the Parliament sits and is neither adjourned nor prorogued, is without precedent, the adjournments upon the books very rarely exceeding a week or ten days, unless by Royal Writ.’—P. 15.

Binckes then proceeds to make seven propositions for adjusting these differences, and setting the question at rest. The most important of these were—II. That the Lower House should have a place of meeting of their own. III. That a committee of both Houses should be appointed to decide the matter in debate, and that in the meantime the Lower House shall always meet on the days on which the Bishops sit. V. That adjournments should generally be not for more than a week. VI. That the schedule shall adjourn the Lower House, but not so as to break short or interrupt the business they are engaged upon. ‘The Expedient,’ met with considerable opposition, and had no effect beyond making an addition to the contro-

¹ ‘History of the Convocation which met, Feb. 6, 1700.’ 4to. 1702.

‘The Narrative of the Lower House vindicated from the exceptions of a Letter intituled, The Right of the Archbishop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation.’ 4to. 1702.

‘Vindication of the Narrative continued.’ 1702. These two are by Hooper.

versy. Gibson replied to it immediately in 'Reflections upon an Expedient proposed,' having previously published 'A Vindication of the Rights of the Archbishop.' In the meantime Kennet and the Upper House party published 'The History of the Convocation of Feb. 6, 1701,' which was drawn from the acts of both Houses, and was intended to counteract 'The Narrative' of the Lower House; and Kennet, in 'A Reconciling Letter,' exposed the contradictions into which the partisans of the Lower House had fallen, and particularly the discrepancies which existed between the first and second edition of Atterbury's 'Rights and Powers:' but the strength of the Bishops' party did not lie in their wit. Several¹ other pamphlets by Kennet and Gibson accused the Lower House of a tendency to Presbyterianism, a charge from which they could defend themselves without much difficulty, although it was from time to time reiterated by their opponents. Binckes says—

'But when they are known to be the most zealous assertors of Episcopacy, and several of them by their former attendances on Archbishops and Bishops, have been bred up to a veneration of the Order, and are the *jure divino* men, the "High Church men," as some call them, that is, they are for opposing all such as are for bringing an Episcopal Church upon the level with other constitutions, though they are upbraided with their "magisterial stiffness," and told the times will not bear it; to accuse such men of encouraging the enemies of Episcopacy, is a contradiction *in terminis*; and one may as well say that a Bishop is an enemy to his own order, and leans to Presbytery.'—*The Expedient*, p. 18.

The Lower House at this time made an endeavour to have their differences settled by presenting a petition to the Queen, that she would cause the question to be examined, which they laid before her December 23, 1702: but no answer was returned to them, except that the Queen 'would consider of their petition,' and they were obliged to return to the old literary warfare.

¹ 'The Pretended Expedient, in a Letter to the author, showing that title to be contrary to the book, especially with relation to the right of an Episcopal Church.' 4to. 1702. By Dr. Sherlock.

'Reflections upon a late Paper, intitled, An Expedient proposed, showing the unreasonableness thereof, &c.' 1702.

'A reconciling Letter upon the late Differences about Convocational Rights and Proceedings.' 1702.

¹ The two first of these are by Kennet, the next by Gibson, and the last by Sherlock.

'A Letter from a Scotch Presbyterian, touching the English Convocation.' June 30, 1702.

'A Letter from the borders of Scotland, concerning somewhat of agreement between a Scotch general assembly and an English provincial Convocation, by an Episcopal Divine.' Sept. 21, 1702.

'The Parallel continued between a Presbyterian assembly and the new model of an English provincial Synod.' Dec. 2, 1702.

'The new danger of Presbytery, or the claims of some in the Lower House of Convocation very dangerous to the institution of an Episcopal and Metropolitcal Church.' 1703.

'The Case of the Schedule stated' was Atterbury's next pamphlet. Atterbury was endowed in perfection with the happy art of putting his opponent out of temper, and even the well-regulated placidity of Gibson at length yielded to its influence. 'The Schedule Reviewed,' in which he took off the arguments of Atterbury and defended those which he had himself advanced, betrays, amid the profusion of information which it exhibits, the marks of a temper which was beginning to be sorely tried. But the great publication of this year was Gibson's 'Synodus Anglicana,' a treatise on Convocation which was perhaps designed to supply the place of the authoritative 'Modus tenendi Convocationem,' the preparation of which had been more than once suggested. It was accompanied by a reprint of all the remaining Journals and Minutes of Convocation. Written upon a theory which was not a correct one, and intended to occupy a place in the controversy which was going on, it is, notwithstanding, distinguished by so large an amount of thoughtful reading, such careful induction, and such a spirit of candour, as to be beyond doubt the work of most real and intrinsic value which the dispute on Convocation called into existence. Dr. Cardwell has reproduced it for the readers of the present day; and it says much for Gibson's arrangement of his matter and treatment of his subject, that an Editor of Dr. Cardwell's experience and erudition, has thought it unnecessary to add much, either of illustration or comment, to the original text. A brief historic preface, written with philosophic calmness and a tendency to liberalism, is sufficient to introduce Gibson's 'Synodus Anglicana' to the Convocation student in the edition of 1854.

Gibson's view was, as we have stated, that the Upper House was the embodiment of the Episcopate, and the Lower of the Presbyterate; and, that the Catholic principle, 'The Bishops are the Synod,' was the leading idea of the Convocation of the English Church. This view was inconsistent with the facts, which the opponents of Gibson appear not to have remembered, that the Upper House originally comprehended the Abbots and Priors, who greatly outnumbered the baronial Bishops; and that many of these latter sat in the Lower House by virtue of their *commendams*, while the inferior or non-baronial suffragan Bishops did so universally. The principles, and even the form of our Church Synods, it is allowed by Gibson himself, were not materially altered at the Reformation; and therefore, as the distinction between the Upper and Lower Houses was not originally coincident with that between the Episcopate and Presbyterate, it seems to us that, to use the language of the schools, *cadit questio*. On this principle, however, the 'Synodus Anglicana' takes *seriatim* the different parts of the Convocation

and their relations to each other—The summoning, The opening, The duties of the Prolocutor, The manner of entering upon business, The rights of the President and Bishops, Those of the inferior Clergy, and the manner of passing business: and the whole of these subjects are treated in so lucid a way, and are illustrated so fully from the practice of those of our former Convocations, whose records are extant, that the 'Synodus Anglicana,' while any vestiges of the ancient Synodal rights of the Church of England are left, must not only be had recourse to, but studied diligently, by those who would ascertain what those rights are.

Shortly after the 'Synodus Anglicana,' Gibson published 'A short state of some present questions in Convocation,' answered by Hooper, in 'A summary defence of the Lower House:'¹ and then Atterbury and Gibson were again matched as combatants. The former brought out 'The Parliamentary Original and Rights of the Lower House,' to which the latter, in 1703, rejoined in 'The pretended Independency of the Lower House upon the Upper,' and vindicated the 'Synodus Anglicana' and 'The Schedule Reviewed,' from the censures of Atterbury. These pamphlets are peculiarly valuable from the precedents which they produce, and the light which they throw upon the relations of the Houses; but the statements of each party require to be checked by those of the other side. Soon after, Gibson, for he was possessed of a perseverance even more indomitable than Atterbury's energy, chanted his own song of victory over the Lower House, and especially over Hooper, in 'The Marks of a defenceless Cause.' Wake's larger work, which we have already noticed, now appeared, and seems rather to have crushed the smaller publications out of existence, for no more works of any peculiar merit come before us during the sitting of this Convocation, which ended in 1705. 'An account of the Proceedings' between the two Houses of Convocation by Dr. Trimnell, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, and 'The Complainer reprov'd,' and 'The Complainer further reprov'd,' by Gibson, are the only pamphlets of consequence; though 'A Collection of Papers' contains many documents of value to a Convocation student.

The next Convocation met October 25th, 1705; and Binckes was elected Prolocutor. The practice of intermediate sessions was revived, and the custom of the Irish Convocation was cited

¹ The following are some minor pamphlets:—

'A Letter from a Clergyman in Ireland, to a Convocation man in England.' Aug. 9, 1703.

'A Representation made by the Lower House of Convocation to the Archbishops and Bishops.' Dec. 1704.

'The Bishop of Sarum's Charge at his triennial Visitation.' 1704.

as a precedent. But the conduct of the Lower House during this Convocation drew down upon themselves a sharp rebuke from the Government, in which the Queen 'declared her resolution to maintain her supremacy, and the due subordination of 'Presbyters to Bishops, as fundamental parts of the constitution 'of the Church of England.' This advantage the Upper House of course made the most of. 'Some Proceedings in the Convocation A.D. 1705, faithfully represented,' the preface to which was written by Atterbury, and replied to by Trimmell, in 'Partiality detected,' is the only pamphlet¹ upon which we need dwell. In it he reflects with much severity, and with some justice, upon the conduct of the Bishops in always ignoring the requests and the proposals, which the Lower House made to them for reforming the abuses and furthering the interests of the Church.

'The coldness and neglect, with which all these requests were received, was very amazing. Of some of them no manner of notice was taken: upon others, the Bishops contented themselves to make observations in writing, without imparting them to the Clergy, and without entering them in their books, where recourse might be had to them: or, perhaps, the Archbishops, at the close of the Convocation, made a speech to the Lower House, and said in it somewhat concerning the several proposals that had been made by them, and there the matter rested, without any further effect.

'When business of high consequence to the Church, and such as was likely to do honour to the promoters of it, was started by the Clergy, attempts of the same kind, without doors, were set forward, which might supersede theirs. Thus, when the Committee I have mentioned was appointed, March 17, 1701, to consider what might be done towards "Propagating the Christian religion, as professed in the Church of England, in our Foreign Plantations," and that committee, (composed of very venerable and experienced men, well suited to such an inquiry) had sat several times at S. Paul's, and made some progress in the business referred to them; a charter was presently procured to place the consideration of that matter in other hands, where it now remains, and will, we hope, produce excellent fruits. But whatever they are, they must be acknowledged to have sprung from the overtures to that purpose first made by the Lower House of Convocation.

'While all motions from the Lower Houses, which tended towards business, were thus checked and repressed, no offers of the same kind were ever made by the Upper; nor anything in eight years proposed from them, besides an address, now and then, with some discriminating clause, which might turn to the reproach of the Clergy, if they complied with it, and render them obnoxious, if they refuted it. We know who said—"If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?" The reverence I bear towards our spiritual Fathers, inclines me rather to leave the application of these words to the reader, than to make it myself.'—Pp. 10, 11 of *Preface*.

¹ Atterbury was also attacked with some humour and much coarseness in 'A Layman's Letter to a great Divine Dr. A. B. C. D.'

The Government at this time seems to have set itself in earnest against the Convocation, which was allowed to do nothing until it was dissolved with the Parliament.

In 1708 a Convocation was summoned, but it was not allowed to meet, and no further transactions are to be recorded until 1710. Atterbury was then chosen Prolocutor in opposition to Kennet, and the business of the Church was proceeded with, with some degree of earnestness. 'A Representation of the present state of Religion,' in which the progress of vice and unbelief in the nation was depicted in very strong and perhaps heightened colours, was drawn up and passed by the Lower House, but was rejected by the Upper, who transmitted to them a softened picture in 'A Representation' of their own.¹ The publications on the controversy which had lasted so long had now dwindled in number.² 'Presbyters are not always an authoritative part of Provincial Synods,' appeared in 1710, and 'The Mitre and the Crown, or a real distinction between them,' and 'A continuation of the Mitre and the Crown,' were published in 1712, and have been generally considered as Atterbury's, although they advocate the independence and rights of the Church and the Convocation with much moderation of tone and language.³ The pamphlets occasioned by Dr. Clarke's controversy as a class by themselves. The Hoadley controversy was soon about to absorb all the attention and the activity of those to whom controversy had become almost a necessary of existence; and was to be more bitter, more wearisome, and more injurious in its effects to the Church, than the dispute we have just gone through. We hurry by it, as we would hurry by a crowded grave-yard after nightfall. No licence since then has been issued to the Convocation; and therefore from the year 1717 its sessions have had no practical result. In 1728,⁴ however, some advances were made towards a reconciliation; and in 1742 the Lower House finally submitted, and it was thought⁵ that they would have proceeded to business:

¹ Atterbury writes, March 15, 1701. 'We appointed another Committee, for considering the methods of *'Propagating the Christian Religion in Foreign Parts,'* who sat the first time this afternoon in the Chapter House of S. Paul's.—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 88.

² 'The Representation Examined' and 'The question of the present Convocation considered in answer to the examiner's unfair representations,' 1711, may be added.

³ 'The Wisdom of Looking Backward,' by Kennet, is a useful work written in defence of the Upper House.

⁴ 'The Humble Address of the Convocation to the King, Feb. 14, 1728, with His Majesty's Answer,' 1728, and also, 'The Address of the Clergy in Convocation to the King, Feb. 14, 1735, with His Majesty's Answer,' 1735.

⁵ It is worth noting that the last motion ever brought before Convocation, which on Jan. 27th, 1742, was ordered to be 'reduced into writing, and the particulars offered to the House at their next assembly,' was this—

'VII. That much reproach is brought upon the benefited, and much oppression

but either the Bishops or the Government were afraid of the consequences. Since that time, until within the last few years, the Synodical rights¹ of the Church of England have been invariably sacrificed either to timid indecision on the one side, or to unconstitutional oppression on the other.

Now let us turn back, and take a review of the long and sterile tract of polemic literature which we have traversed. How utterly profitless it looks! After all the toil, the research, the learning, the industry, the genius, the contention, that had been wasted on it, there were no results whatever; no apparent results at least for good, though there were results for evil.

Before it began the Convocation had been silent for more than ten years; but before its close it was condemned to a silence of more than a century. The disputings of those angry partisans have become, unfairly enough, a standing argument of some speciousness against the revival of its powers; while a more forcible, because a truer one, lies in its inactivity for all Church purposes, of which their litigiousness was the cause. We have traced out the features of the quarrel, and have in doing it used a tone of levity, which at first sight would appear wrong on a subject so nearly connected with what, as Christians, we must hold holy. But we have done this intentionally; for, we feel sure that in many instances—we will not in charity say in all—the disputants sought their own honour more than that of the Church. They² desired to bring themselves into notice, because notice led to preferment or to power: and the efficiency and development of the principles of the Church became too often in their eyes mere stepping-stones by which their own interests and those of their party might be carried higher.

upon the unbeneficed Clergy, by Curates accepting too scanty salaries from Incumbents.'

But the next sessions, March 5th, 1742, the Prolocutor, Dr. Lisle, was afraid to go on with any business, and so the subject dropped.

See 'A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Lisle, Prolocutor, by the Archdeacon of Lincoln.'

¹ 'A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, from a Member of Convocation,' 1742, is an indignant remonstrance against the suppression of Convocational Rights.

² Atterbury writes:—'If the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Hooper) be made Bishop, (of S. Asaph) with a design to give him the chief hand in the administration of Ecclesiastical affairs, I, my Lord, am sure to be oppressed and kept under as much as if Archbishop Tillotson were alive and at the helm; for that I prepare myself, and God's will be done in it! However, let the Dean of Canterbury be as great as he will, I must take the liberty to tell him, that it was my poor labours that made him so. For had not the book I wrote procured a Convocation, and given him by that means an opportunity of forming a strong body of the Clergy, and placing himself at the head of them, he could not have made it necessary for the Crown to take notice of him in order to bring things to a temper; but would have continued Dean of Canterbury still. In return for this, I know, I am to be neglected and sacrificed, as far as he is able to bring it about.'—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 209.

They had their reward. They became Bishops, it is true:—almost every one of the names we have just been so often repeating is to be found in the roll of the English Episcopate. Yet it is a perilous thing to receive a bishopric as a reward, for any work however good. It is still more perilous to look forward to it as such. Wake, with his real religious feeling, and the perception which he had, however dim, of the value of Catholic unity, cannot but have repented himself, while he watched the slow decay of the Church's life under the influence of the Hanoverian dynasty. And the close of Atterbury's life, with its melancholy interest, is a subject, if ever there was one, with which

To point a moral, or adorn a tale.

Had these men, with their great intellectual power and their acquired talents, been really single in their motives, and employed only pure and righteous means to attain the end for which they strove so hard, we cannot believe that the Lord of the Church would have allowed them to have been made first the tools and next the laughing-stocks of Ministers of State,¹ who were infidels or schismatics. We do not judge them, for the times were difficult and evil; but facts do. The Church of England after their days fell into a state of spiritual poverty and wretchedness, only not worse than death:—a state in which the very religious truth and manliness of Wesley was by a sad necessity made the stumbling-block for his soul. *Post hoc, ergo, propter hoc*, is not always a fallacy.

We are upon the eve of another synodal movement. It has been long waited for, and prayed for; and it is now begun. The reform and revival of our ancient Church Assembly in Convocation, which once seemed to be beyond hope or even fancy, is now in hand. Our Church must take a lesson from the past. She must watch, and hope, and strive, that the movement of our days may not either in its history or its event resemble the movement of 1697—1742. That began in power and ended in weakness; it originated in the self-glory of man, and resulted in the dishonour of the Church; it was 'of the earth, earthy.' May this be in all points otherwise!

That it may be so, the restoration of her Synods to our own portion of the Church Catholic must be sought from a right motive and carried out in a right spirit. Honest uprightness

¹ 'A Private Letter that the Lord Bishop of S—— had reported in the House of Lords, that the Lord T——r had frequently boasted to his friends that he had bamboozled the Convocation; i. e. set them to work for amusement only, and a little to burn their own fingers.—Kennet, in 1711, quoted in Lathbury's History of Convocation, 2d edition, p. 417.

and self-devotion must constitute the means used for their attainment. The brightness of the divinely-arranged machinery of Church Government must not be tarnished by ambition or lust of self-display in individuals, nor clogged by the earthly policies of ministries or of factions; it must be allowed to do its work freely, with that efficiency which is not its own,—guided, as far as man is allowed to guide it, with clean and earnest hands,—and directed always to high and holy ends, to the increase of the glory of God, and to the furtherance of the present and future welfare of Christ's Church and of His poor. A Synod is a holy thing. *Tà ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις.*

- ART. IV.—1. *Theologia Moralis S. Alphonsi de Liguori, Fundatoris Congregationis SS. Redemptoris ac olim Episcopi S. Agathæ Gothorum.* Editio novissima; curavit P. MICH. HEILIG, Congr. SS. Redempt. Presbyter, et Professor Theol. Moralis. Parisiis, 1845.
2. *Homo Apostolicus, sive Praxis et Instructio Confessariorum.* Auctore illustrissimo et reverendissimo D. Alphonso de Liguori, Editio nova. Moguntiae, 1842.
3. *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis S. Alphonsi Mariæ de Liguori,* Auctore D. NEYRAGUET, Presbytero Diœcesis Ruthenensis Missionario. Liburni, 1851.
4. *Cases of Conscience, or Lessons in Morals.* Sixth Edition. London, 1853.

THAT S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori's *Theologia Moralis* is the latest exponent of Rome's moral system we have already made clear, in an article which appeared in our January number of the present year. We showed that he had been beatified and canonized so late as the year 1839, that the Sacred Congregation of Rites had examined his system of morality twenty times, and had agreed, 'with concordant voice, with unanimous consent, with one voice and with one mind,' that it contained nothing to be censured. We showed that an authoritative document issuing from the Sacred Penitentiary in 1831, decreed that the opinions professed in the Blessed Alfonso's Moral Theology might with safety be followed and professed, on the ground that the Holy Apostolic See had declared that it found nothing in his works worthy of censure; and that the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon had required his clergy to adhere to the judgment of Rome by following and reducing to practice the opinions of the Blessed Alfonso de' Liguori, all doubt whatever being thrown aside. But it appears that the beatification, canonization, commendation, approbation, ratification, and sanction have not been sufficient to persuade some of our readers that all members of the Roman Church are really tied to accepting his morality. Indeed with respect to Englishmen who are members of the Roman Communion, we cannot wonder at a little kicking, and plunging, and tossing the yoke, when they find what they have to bear. We must, therefore, add more testimony, showing on unimpeachable authority that Rome is committed to S. Alfonso, and that his morality is her morality.

The preface to his Moral Theology opens as follows. 'The new edition of S. Alfonso de' Liguori's Moral Theology, which has been long looked for from the Mechlin press, is at last published. The work which is thus issued afresh after innumerable editions and no small labour, is not only the teaching of a very learned, experienced, and wise author, but of a Saint; and it is approved by the judgment of the Catholic Church itself. We hold, therefore, that it is a superfluous task to commend or defend it against those who find fault with it, since it has been commended and defended by the oracle of the Church itself.'

Again: 'We have issued a work in which, by the judgment of the Roman Church itself, there is found nothing, no opinion and no principle, which is deserving of censure; of this we are most perfectly assured by the decree concerning the revision of S. Alfonso's works. The teaching of Benedict XIV. about the canonization of Saints shows us what force the Apostolic approbation has, and what is the mind of the Church in approving of the writings of the servants of God with a view to their canonization. In our times all the writings of a servant of God, who is to be placed among the Blessed, must be subjected to an extremely rigid examination according to the decrees of Urban VIII., and the approved teaching of Benedict XIV. And the purpose of a judicial revision of this nature is that it may be seen whether the teaching of the servant of God be free from all theological censure. Now every proposition which is heretical, erroneous, approaching to error, savouring of heresy or error, suspected of error, rash, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, ill-sounding, misleading to the simple, schismatical, injurious, impious, or blasphemous, is subject to theological censure, several sorts of which Benedict himself recounts. The revisers are bound to note if there is in the works any error against faith or good morals, or any new doctrine unaccordant with the sense of the Church; meaning by new doctrine, not anything brought forward in a new way, but something put forth which is really new, vain, and useless, opposed to Scripture and to the Fathers. It is the duty, therefore, of the revisers to subject every single proposition to its own special censure, and to pass judgment on the quality of the propositions as they are in themselves, independently of the author's intention, so that it is impossible to proceed further when once they find that the servant of God has written anything against the faith, or good morals, or the sense of the Church, although he wrote it with a good intention. An examination of this nature having been instituted with a view to the canonization of S. Alfonso de' Liguori, and the Church

‘having declared that in his works there was found nothing worthy of censure, it follows that it is safe for any one to follow and profess the opinions which S. Alfonso professes in his Moral Theology, and that no man is to be troubled for doing so, although he may not have weighed the reasons on which the several opinions rest.’

The meaning of *nihil censuræ dignum* is then further explained to be a true approbation ‘by which it is certain that the whole teaching of our saintly author is altogether free from every error which the Church now sees to be error. The works of S. Alfonso, therefore, rejoice in this highest and singular privilege, which those of no uncanonized moral writers can possess, for in their case it is not made certain by so solemn a judgment of the Church, that there is no error, no erroneous principle, no erroneous opinion in their writings. But we are now made quite sure, by the infallible judgment of the Catholic Church, that in S. Alfonso’s works, in the whole of his Moral Theology, there is not one principle disapproved, not one opinion against the faith or good morals, new, unaccordant with the sense of the Church, heretical, erroneous, approaching to error, savouring of heresy or error, suspected of error, rash, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, ill-sounding, misleading to the simple, schismatical, injurious, impious, or blasphemous. And this being so, who will not confess that in the matter of morals, grave and difficult as it is, and so involved with doubts and questions, minds are wonderfully set at rest by an approbation of this nature, which if not called formally positive, is practically the same?’

Neyraguet is no less happy and confident. Having quoted the approbation of Pope Pius VII., Pope Leo XII., Pope Pius VIII., and Pope Gregory XVI., he continues: ‘Thus by acting and by teaching, to heaven flew off the Blessed One. What can you prize higher? what happier lot can you wish for yourself? There is then no danger of erring, no possibility of fearing hell in following the steps of so great a man. It is no wonder, therefore, that in these times this Theology is everywhere desired and sought after; that it is extolled with the highest praises by prelates of Churches, and the chiefest doctors, not only in Italy, but also in Germany, Belgium, France, &c.; that it is circulated throughout the whole world, and is in the hands of almost all the clergy. What then can be more absurd than to find fault with a work of such singular excellence, which innumerable doctors and so many oracles of the Holy See have so highly commended!’

In the same way the Redemptorist Father who has translated S. Alfonso’s *Glories of Mary*, stands over some reluctant friends

whom he mentally anticipates as recalcitrating at some of the tales which are recounted, like Queen Eleanor before Fair Rosamond, with his *nihil censuræ dignum* in one hand, and his book in the other, and tells them to take their choice between condemning the Holy See, and swallowing the miracles, having himself, with delightful inconsistency, omitted two of the stories as being totally impossible of digestion to an English stomach. 'Remember,' he says, 'that it has been strictly examined by the authority which is charged by God Himself to instruct you, and that that authority has declared that it contains NOTHING worthy of censure, and that it has been welcomed by all lovers of Jesus and Mary, throughout the world, with enthusiasm.'¹

The Bull of Canonization was issued by the present Pope's predecessor, Gregory XVI., and in it we find the late Pontiff announcing as *imprimis notatu dignum, quod licet copiosissime scripserit, ejusdem tamen opera inoffenso prorsus pede percurri a fidelibus posse, post diligens institutum examen persepsectum fuerit.* If any ask, even yet, for evidence, the following passage from the Life of S. Alfonso de' Liguori, edited by the Fathers of the Oratory, and approved and recommended by Cardinal Wiseman, may satisfy them. 'The works of S. Alphonso not only do not contain any proposition whatever which can be called schismatical or scandalous, but also none which are either pernicious, erroneous, or rash; the morals, therefore, of this saintly Bishop cannot be censured without setting up as a censor of authority itself; without, in fine, censuring the decision of the Holy See.'

The character of Rome's moral teaching is then irrevocably tied to the character of Liguori's teaching. And it must not be thought that he is the representative of a lax school among Romish Casuists. On the contrary, he makes it his greatest boast that he is not an extreme man, that he is not over-strict or over-lax, but holds the middle course. 'In completing this work,' he says in his Preface to his *Homo Apostolicus*, speaking of the *Theologia Moralis*, 'I have toiled for fifteen years, going over and weighing the teaching of very many

¹ P. xviii. The *Glorie di Maria* is a book which S. Alfonso tells us that he has printed for the sake of providing Priests with materials for sermons on Saturdays, and for *Novenas* in honour of S. Mary. From the headings to the chapters we learn that S. Mary is Queen of Mercy and our loving Mother; that she obtains us the pardon of our sins and perseverance, and renders death sweet; that she is the Hope of all; that her Intercession is necessary for our salvation; that she is a tender Advocate, able to save all; that she is the Peace-maker between sinners and God; that she delivers her clients from hell, succours her clients in purgatory, and leads her servants to heaven; that she is the Treasury of all divine graces; that she offered to God the life of her Son; that she is the Queen of Martyrs;—together with many more 'new inventions of honours,' as Father F. W. Faber approvingly terms them. Cardinal Wiseman cordially recommends the English translation to the Faithful. So do we. We think few books on the subject more instructive.

‘writers whom I have examined. Some I found too indulgent, for led by a false zeal for expediting the salvation of souls, they have granted too much liberty, not without prejudice to the laws divine and ecclesiastical; and others I found who, detesting so great compliance, have fallen into the other extreme of excessive rigour. This has been my greatest labour, to select from such a congeries of opinions those sentiments which on one side have due regard to the precepts of God and of the Church, and which on the other do not add burdens which have not been imposed by God, nor tie every one to a perfection which human weakness renders morally impossible to the common run of the faithful.’ And again in the preface to the *Theologia Moralis* itself: ‘So I have determined to publish this new work to hold a middle place between too lax and too severe opinions.’ And in his tract upon Conscience: ‘I protest that as I do not approve of confessors who adhere to over-great austerity, and condemn using a number of opinions which rest on a grave foundation; so on the other hand, I cannot approve of those who easily admit opinions as probable, which are without sure foundation.’¹ In fact Liguori is a safe *via media* man, as Rome counts safeness.²

At first sight there seems a certain degree of security in an Authorized Book of Morals, but second thoughts will show that such an impression is altogether unfounded. It can only be a help on the side of liberty, not on that of strictness. No sort of lax opinions are thus put down. They stand upon their own ground, just as though there were no such book at all. They are neither approved nor condemned, and are left to the individual conscience. But all the opinions which are given and commended in such a book, whether strict or lax, are thenceforward

¹ Theol. Mor. l. i. § 83.

² The strict school consists of Merbesius, Contensonius, Natalis Alexander, Jueninus, Cabassutius, Collet, Genettus, Petrocorensis, and Concina, almost all of whom, it will be seen, are Gallicans. It was really for its strict moral teaching, and not for its speculative dogmas, that Jansenism, the child of Gallicanism, was proscribed. ‘The Jansenists,’ says their enemy Francolinus, ‘have their Theology, both speculative, and practical or moral: their speculative Theology is Jansenism, their practical or moral Theology is Rigorism. This has three principles. To make very much of the Fathers, little of the Pontiffs, nothing of modern Theologians. To pay true regard to the Fathers, as quoted by themselves, a pretended regard to the Pontiffs, to the other Doctors neither one nor the other. Never to leave S. Augustin, real or spurious, and not interpret the Doctor by Councils, but Councils by him: sometimes to go near Pontiffs when teaching *ex cathedra* and to profess to do so—if, that is, they are not against them. Always to avoid Schoolmen, especially those of the two last ages, in controversies with respect to morals, both in subject and in manner of speech, and not even to read them, far less make honourable mention of them in their writings and books.’ Well would it have been for France and for the Christian Church, had not maligned Jansenism fallen beneath the calumnies and the violence of its semi-Pelagian assailants! And well would it be for France now if she could recall the spirit of her Arnauds and her Pascals, instead of cherishing in her bosom the extremes of Ultramontaniam!

sacred. The only result, therefore, is, that if there are any *lax* opinions in it, those opinions receive a sanction, without which a conscientious mind would not have allowed itself to adopt them.

The evils of this are shown in the case of Equivocation. As we have already shown, a person committed to the defence of Liguori's Theory of Truthfulness must maintain, that when asked a question which cannot but be answered in the affirmative, it is truthful to reply, '*I say, no*;' intending the questioner to understand that you deny his question, but meaning in your own mind simply to affirm that you are making use of the word *no* in the course of your conversation.¹ He must justify the once well-known principle, 'Ἡ γλῶσσ' ὁμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος; for that is identical with the principle adopted by Liguori, that when a man has sworn only externally, he has not sworn, he has joked.² He must hold that a man may insert a *not* into an affirmative sentence in a whisper, not heard so as to be understood by the other party, and that his oath is then truthful, though he means to swear *no*, and the other conceives that he is swearing *yes*.³ He must maintain that a witness in a court of justice has not only the liberty of lying, but that it is his duty to lie, if the crime about which his evidence is required is otherwise unknown.⁴ He must not dare to express indignation at the four answers allowed to the adulterous wife: 1. That

¹ Theol. Mor. l. iv. 151.

² L. iv. 171.

³ L. iv. 168.

⁴ L. iv. 154.—In the trial of Boyle v. Wiseman, which took place in the course of the month of August of the present year, the object of the plaintiff's counsel being to prove that the defendant had written a letter which had been published with his name, the following is reported as having occurred: 'Dr. T. Grant was then examined. He said, "I am the Roman Catholic Bishop of S. George's, Southwark. I know the defendant, and am upon intimate terms with him. I remember going to Paris on the subject of this libel, but I don't remember having had any conversation with the defendant relating to it. I had a conversation with a gentleman belonging to the *Univers* journal, but he did not give me any MS. I am quite sure the defendant never told me that he wrote the letter signed 'Nicholas, Cardinal Wiseman,' which is the subject of the present action." The Rev. George Spencer, known as Father Ignatius, was the next witness. He said, "I am intimately acquainted with Cardinal Wiseman, but I don't see much of him. I remember reading the article in the *Catholic Standard*, and I had a few words with the Cardinal on the subject. All I can remember that he said was that he had reason to know that Boyle had communicated the article that appeared in the *Ami de la Religion*. He did not say a word of the authorship of the letter." "Did you say to him, 'I have read your letter, Cardinal Wiseman?'" "I don't remember." (The witness gave his evidence in such a low tone and so confusedly, that the jury several times requested him to speak louder and more plainly, as they could not hear what he said.) "I cannot say how the conversation began. The Cardinal did not send me to the plaintiff to try to arrange this matter, but I did go to Mr. Ivors on the subject.—I don't remember the words that passed afterwards between me and the Cardinal. I am certain he did not tell me the letter was his, and I did not tell him that it was his. I went to the plaintiff (Mr. Boyle) of my own accord, and I afterwards communicated with the Cardinal. My object was to endeavour to settle this action." "Surely you can tell us what passed between you?" "No, I do not remember." "Why how long ago is it since this occurred?" "About a month." "And you mean to swear you have no recollection of what occurred?" "I do: I only recollect what I have

she had not broken the marriage (meaning to herself that the marriage was still existing); 2. That she ~~was~~ innocent of the crime (meaning to herself that she had been absolved of the guilt of the crime after confession); 3. That she had not committed adultery (meaning to herself that she had not committed idolatry); 4. That she had not committed adultery (meaning to herself so as to have to tell her husband).¹ He must not denounce as wicked the doctrine that a man who has seduced a maiden, on promise of marrying her, is *not* bound to keep his promise, if he is of considerably higher birth, or if he is considerably richer, whether the victim did or did not know of any disparity between him and herself.² If he is a 'good Catholic,' he will hold with the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon, that on these points 'the judgment of Rome should be fully adhered to, and that the opinions of the Blessed Alfonso de' Liguori should be followed' and reduced to practice, all doubt whatever being thrown aside.' If not so enthusiastic as the Cardinal Archbishop, yet he is absolutely bound to hold that the above teaching is not erroneous, rash, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, ill-sounding or misleading to the simple.

We will now examine the Theory of Theft; and we shall see there the same evil as in the case of Equivocation—laxity encouraged by the sanction of authority: and we shall, in another instance, learn what is the nature of that morality which Rome inculcates through her Confessors and her Directors.

'What is theft? It is the secret and unjust taking-away of a thing belonging to another, when the owner is reasonably unwilling.'—L. iv. 518.

told you." "What else did the Cardinal say? What did he say relative to the matter?" "*I don't recollect.*"

We have no cause for thinking that Bishop Grant and Father Ignatius are gifted with good memories; therefore we conclude that they have short memories. But it is an interesting inquiry, as a purely speculative question, What must they have done on the received principles of Roman Moral Theology if they *had* recollected that Cardinal Wiseman had told them that he was the author of the letter signed by his name? They must have done exactly what they did. Otherwise, they would have 'sinned by discovering the truth which they ought to have concealed.' (L. v. 270.) '*If in a trial the crime is altogether concealed, the witness may, nay he is bound, to say that the defendant has not committed it.*' (L. iv. 154.) This would be exactly our hypothetical case: for in matter of fact, the trial was quashed because 'the crime' of having written the libel was 'concealed;' therefore 'the witnesses were bound,' even if they had known the contrary to be true, 'to say the defendant had not committed it.' This is, to say the least, remarkable. We should scarcely have thought it possible—indeed without S. Alfonso's assistance we never should have thought it possible—that when English gentlemen were giving evidence upon their oath in an English court of justice, and were questioned as to whether or no they recollected something taking place, they should be religiously and morally bound not to allow the fact of their recollection or non-recollection to make any difference in their answer.

¹ L. iv. 162.

² L. iv. 644.

This is an awkward beginning. Who is to be the judge, whether the owner is reasonable or unreasonable in wishing to keep his goods himself? If he is likely to have a prejudice on the side of possession, the thief is at least as likely to have a prejudice on the side of abstraction. We suppose that it will be necessary to call in the Director to settle the point between them.¹

Having got our definition of theft, we may see what acts of taking other people's goods are not thieving, which unenlightened consciences might conceive to be such. Five kinds of such acts are at once enumerated. The first is that of a man who takes what is another's by way of joke. We may let that pass. 'I only did it in fun,' has always been accounted a sufficient excuse to save a schoolboy from anything beyond a reprimand. At the same time such jokes might be unpleasant: and, if we are to judge from this and from the other case, already mentioned, of the man who swore only externally, and therefore did not swear but joked, Liguori must have a very dismal notion of jesting.

The next is that of one who takes what is another's for the latter's good or advantage, 'As if a wife take away money from her husband, that he may not waste it on games or feasting, or take away wine from him that he may not get drunk, or *an heretical book that he may not read it*; or if a servant gives a very poor man alms of no very great amount, which his master would not be reasonably unwilling that he should give, although for shame, or some other reason, he does not dare to ask him.' This is a principle which might be extensively applied, especially if it should happen that a lady were married to an heretical husband. But we shall have occasion again to consider the case of wives, children, and servants separately.

The third case of taking not thieving carries us up at once to first principles.

'It is certain that a man who is in extreme necessity may purloin other people's goods, enough to free himself from such a necessity. So the doctors hold, "in common,"² with S. Thomas. The holy Doctor's reason is, that in such a case all things are common, for the law of nations by which a division of goods was made, cannot derogate from natural law by which every man is allowed to provide for himself, so long as he labours under extreme necessity. The same is said when the necessity is next to extreme or equivalent to it, for in such a necessity, which is called very grave or quasi-extreme, a man may also provide for himself,' (mark the euphemism).

¹ In the *Homo Apostolicus*, the cases in which the owner is regarded as unreasonable in his unwillingness to part with his goods to the thief are when the latter is in extreme necessity, or when he is justly compensating himself, but no such limit to his unreasonableness is laid down in the *Theologia Moralis*.

² For the technical meaning of 'common opinion,' and of 'probable and more probable opinion,' we must refer our readers to the *Christian Remembrancer*, No. LXXXIII. Jan. 1854, p. 44.

“by ordinary means, but not by strange and extraordinary. So, “in common,” Lugo, Lessius, Sporer, the Salamanca Doctors, Navarrus, Soto, Cajetan, Prado, &c., Viva, Sylvius, Azorius, Croix, Cardenas, Haunoldus, and Tamburini, the last of whom calls the opinion certain. But a very grave necessity of this kind is supposed to exist when a man is in probable risk of incurring death, or indeed in danger of losing some principal member, or some sense, such as an eye; also when a man is in danger of falling into perpetual captivity, or being sent to the galleys, or catching a very grave or lasting disease, or incurring loss of character. For it is not necessary that evils of this kind should be actually upon the man, but it is enough that they are very near him, and morally certain, or indeed—Holzmans says—if there is certainly probable danger of them. But it is doubted whether a father is supposed to labour under the same necessity if he is in danger of prostituting his daughter through want. Bonacina says Yes, and Mazzotta, Cajetan, Suarez, &c., agree. But “with greater probability” the Salamanca Doctors say No, because no necessity can compel a man to sin when there is any other way of relieving his necessity, such as at least he has in begging. But what, if a nobleman is very much ashamed to beg or to work, can he provide for himself out of other people’s goods? The Salamanca Doctors say No, with Soto and Prado, on the ground that this must be rather counted grave than extreme necessity, temporal goods being ordained only for preserving life, not for keeping honour. But Viva says Yes, and Roncaglia and Mazzotta, as well as Lessius, Palao, and Diocastillo in Croix: so do Bannez and Serra. And this seems to me the “more probable,” if he is so ashamed of begging that he would rather die than beg.—L. iv. 520.

Six times in the course of three pages in his *Homo Apostolicus*, sixteen times in the course of one section of a chapter in his *Theologia Moralis*, Liguori lays down the principle that, as soon as a man is reduced to extreme necessity, all goods become common, and, more than this, that the thief—we beg pardon, the clandestine taker—has a right to what belongs to others. We need not say that we here find ourselves referred to the fundamental principle of Communism, just as Mariana appeals to the fundamental principle of Red Republicanism, when he asserts that every private man has a right to stab the king who has been declared a public enemy.¹

Now that a case might arise in which circumstances would justify appropriation is a proposition which we do not deny, and

¹ ‘Any private man, whoever he may be, has a right equal to the best, to kill the king declared a public enemy: let him only have the will to fling away hopes of impunity, despise the risk, and dare attempt to serve his country. I never will believe that he who makes essay to slay him has done anything whatever which he has not a right to do. . . . It is indeed more virtuous and more magnanimous openly to satisfy the grudge and fall upon the country’s enemy before the eyes of all the world. But there is more prudence in trying to catch him, as in a trap, by artifice. For then the happy issue comes without tumult and with the certainty of less danger, public as well as private. . . . Whether open force is resorted to, and he is struck down in the midst of insurrection and arms publicly taken up . . . or with greater caution he dies by stratagem or device, a single man devoting himself, or a few sworn together secretly against his life and struggling each at his own peril to redeem his country safe! Suppose that they escape! Like great demi-deities they are revered their whole life long. And if they fall, they fall a sacrifice grateful to the gods and grateful unto men, in a noble undertaking, and are illustrious to all posterity!’—Mariana, pp. 60, 65, as quoted in *Cases of Conscience*, p. 51.

it is this modicum of truth which blinds Liguori and his followers in the instance before us. If it be true that it might happen, under very peculiar circumstances, that a man might be justified in appropriating what was not his, it does not follow that it should be laid down as a general rule to guide practice that as soon as a man is reduced to extreme necessity he is relieved from paying any regard to the laws of property: and then that the term 'extreme necessity' should be so liberally interpreted as to include under it every distressed nobleman. Take this last case and analyze it. It is precisely the case of the Unjust Steward, provided that the latter was a man of high birth, or indeed even that would not be necessary, for *vir honoratus* would scarcely mean more than a man holding a respectable position. This parable has caused much difficulty to such commentators as did not mark that 'the lord' there spoken of is like the Steward himself, a man of the earth, earthy, and, in addition, that the commendation does not belong to the morality of the act done, but to the cleverness displayed in doing it. No such difficulties need be felt by them if they will take Liguori for their guide. 'I cannot dig, to beg I am ashamed.' Then says S. Alfonso, you are justified in clandestinely taking. 'If a man in an honourable position is very much ashamed to beg or to work, may he provide for himself out of other persons' goods? The Salamanca Doctors &c. say No—but Viva &c. say 'Yes, and this seems to me the "more probable."' The ingenuity which has contrived to bring the distressed nobleman into the category of those labouring under extreme necessity, is as commendable as the Unjust Steward's own cleverness. The method in which it is done is as follows:—It was necessary to make some kind of explanation of what extreme necessity is. In doing this it appeared hard to be too strict and rigid, and so *extreme* necessity was softened down into *grave* necessity. So Lessius, Malderus, &c. Here, however, Innocent XI. stepped in—that same Innocent who, as we have seen, attempted to put a stop to the practice of Mental Restriction. But he and his Jansenist morality has fared no better in the matter of Theft than in that of Untruthfulness. Then, as we may recollect, on his condemning mental restriction, mental restriction was divided into two classes, morally undistinguishable, pure mental restriction, and non-pure mental restriction, and his condemnation was confined by the Casuists to the former. Here he condemns the proposition 'that it is allowable to steal not only in extreme but also in grave necessity.' The Casuists hear and obey the Papal voice. But the Pontiff spoke only of *grave*, he said nothing of *very grave* necessity: so *gravi* is changed into *gravissimâ*, and the Jansenist Pope's decree goes for nothing. To permit a man to

steal in grave necessity is immoral, says Innocent. True, but to permit a man to steal in very grave necessity is moral, reply the Casuists, and we have the privilege of explaining what 'very grave' means. This they accordingly proceed to do. And first a man is to be considered labouring under very grave necessity, if he is in probable danger of incurring death—next, if he is in danger of losing a principal limb—then, if he is in very near risk of being imprisoned for life—or of being sent to the galleys—or of catching a very bad disease—or of incurring disgrace. This last heading covers the case of the distressed nobleman. He would feel disgraced if he were to dig or to beg; therefore he is *unable* to have recourse to this method of relieving his wants, and is labouring under very grave or quasi-extreme need. That is all that is necessary. At once the laws of *meum and tuum*, so far as he is concerned, have perished. He may take what he wants. In providing for his needs out of other people's goods he cannot steal if he would. But if a man's want is so pressing that he is in risk of prostituting his daughter, the same authority tells us that that does not justify him in 'providing for himself.' To save his own character in the eyes of men he may take clandestinely. To save his daughter's ruin of body and soul he may not.

In connexion with this subject of extreme necessity, there are, says Liguori, many difficult questions. They are, 1., whether men in captivity to the Turks may purloin what is not theirs, and whether rich men are bound to redeem them. To this question Rome's oracle replies: 'In this doubt, which has heaped upon me a mighty confusion, and on which the Doctors speak so obscurely, I dare not decide anything. It is enough to have put forward the arguments of both sides. Let the wiser judge.' Question 2. is, whether a poor man in extreme necessity may secretly purloin (*occulte alienum surripere*) without going through the previous ceremony of begging. To this Coninchius answers in the negative; Lessius, Layman, and Concina, in a qualified affirmative; Cardinal Lugo and Liguori have recourse to a *distinguendum*. In reply to Question 3. we learn that 'no one is bound to spend so much as 600*l.* or 800*l.* to save another man's life, although the donor should not lose his station by giving more.' Question 4. asks if the thief who consumes what he has taken away in extreme necessity has to restore it. Palao, Concina, Navarrus, Diana, Sporer, Lessius, and Tamburini, are on the negative side; 'On the grounds that, as in extreme necessity all things become common, the thief has not only the right of taking others' goods, but also of consuming them, just as he has the right of purloining again.' Lessius, Sylvius, Armilla, Azorius, and

Concina, are on the other side. Liguori thinks both 'probable.' The 5th question is whether the purloiner is bound to restore when his extreme necessity has ceased. Here there are three opinions. The first, affirmative, supported by seven Doctors; the second, negative, supported by eight Doctors; the third, a *distinguendum*, supported by twelve Doctors. Question 6. asks, If a rich man, who does not help a poor man in extreme necessity, is afterward bound to restore? Here there are eight Doctors on the affirmative side, nine on the negative, which Liguori says is the 'more probable;' 'for, though the poor man 'has a right to take the rich man's goods, yet the same justice 'does not require the rich man to give.'

The next case of purloining not thieving, is 'when a man 'takes by way of just compensation, if he cannot otherwise get 'what is due to him; *e. g.* if a servant cannot get just wages 'otherwise, or if he has been unfairly induced to undertake the 'place at an unfair price.' This being a liberty given especially to domestics (though not confined to them), we shall defer its consideration till we are able to take a panoramic view of the indulgences granted by Rome to wives, children, and servants, to take clandestinely at the expense of the master of the house. At present we will content ourselves with Pascal's illustration of the principle in the story of John d'Alba.

"Father Bauny," said the monk, "has established a prime maxim in favour of those who are not content with their wages: 'May servants who are dissatisfied with their wages use means to raise them, by laying hands on as much of the property of their masters as they may consider necessary to make the said wages equivalent to their trouble? They may, in certain circumstances; as when they are so poor that, in looking for a situation, they have been obliged to accept the offer made to them; and when other servants of the same class are gaining more than they elsewhere.'" "Ha, Father!" cried I, "that is John d'Alba's passage, I declare." "What John d'Alba?" inquired the Father; "what do you mean?" "Strange, Father," returned I, "do you not remember what happened in this city in the year 1647? Where in the world were you living at that time?" "I was teaching Cases of Conscience in one of our colleges at a distance from Paris," he replied.

"I see you don't know the story, Father: I must tell it you. I heard it related the other day by a man of honour whom I met in company. He told us that this John d'Alba, who was in the service of your fathers, in the College of Clermont, in the Rue St. Jacques, being dissatisfied with his wages, had purloined something to make himself amends; and that your fathers, on discovering the theft, had thrown him into prison on the charge

¹ Elsewhere we find:—'If a man gets something by borrowing, hiring or asking, and then consumes it in extreme necessity, he is not bound to make restitution. Nay, "probably" he is not bound to restore what he has previously stolen and afterwards consumed in this necessity, because his stealing does not take away from him the right which in such a case he had to the thing, no more than if he had taken it when actually in the necessity and consumed it.'—L. iv. 623.

² L. iv. 520.

of larceny. His case was reported to the court, if I recollect right, on the 16th of April, 1647; for he was very minute in his statements, and, indeed, they would hardly have been credible otherwise. The poor fellow, on being questioned, confessed to *having taken* some pewter plates, but maintained, nevertheless, that he *had not stolen* them; pleading in his defence this very doctrine of Father Bauny, which he produced before the judges, along with a pamphlet by one of your fathers, under whom he had studied Cases of Conscience, and who had taught him the same thing. Whereupon M. De Montrouge, one of the most respected members of the court, said, in giving his opinion, 'That he did not see how they could discharge the accused on the ground of these fathers' writings, containing as they did a doctrine so illegal, pernicious, and contrary to all laws, natural, divine, and human, and calculated to ruin all families, and sanction all sorts of household robbery. But his opinion was, that this too faithful disciple should be whipped before the college-gate by the hand of the common hangman, who should at the same time burn the writings of those fathers which treated of larceny, with certification that they were prohibited from teaching such doctrines in future, upon pain of death.'

"The result of this judgment, which was heartily approved of, was waited for with much curiosity, when some incident occurred which made them delay proceedings. But in the meantime the prisoner disappeared nobody knew how, and nothing more was heard about the affair; so that John d'Alba got off, pewter plates and all. Such was the account he gave us; to which he added, that the judgment of M. De Montrouge was entered on the records of the court, where any one may consult it. We were highly amused with the anecdote." "What are you trifling about now?" cried the monk; "what does all that signify? I was explaining the maxims of our Casuists, and was just going to speak of those relating to gentlemen, when you interrupt me with impertinent stories." "It was something suggested by the way, Father," I observed.—*Letter vi.*

We will only add here that John d'Alba would, as we shall presently show, be equally justified by S. Alfonso's system of morals, as by that of Father Bauny, in spite of another fruitless attempt of Innocent XI., which we shall notice in its place. The last case of purloining not thieving is interesting to our Eastern *protégés* at the present moment, and may be of some advantage to our French allies—more, happily, to them than to our own soldiers—in preparing their commissariat on the Danube. All, and more than all, that the Emperor of Russia requires for his justification is freely allowed him. The Czar's claim is not a tenth part as bold as that of Molina, Cajetan, Victorelli, Naldus, Duvallius, Rebellus, Velasquez, Covarruvias and Diana, any one of which theologians is of sufficient authority to make the opinion which he espouses 'probable,' and therefore enough for a sovereign to act upon.

'A bye-question here arises whether Christians may lawfully purloin the property of Turks? If Christians are captives in Turkish territories, it is certain that they may purloin from their masters enough for their redemption and for their return home, by way of compensation for their unjust slavery, and the losses which they consequently suffer. This is according to a decree of the Sacred Congregation, Aug. 23, 1630, in which it is declared—"Captives, unjustly detained by unbelievers, may take from their own masters, without doing wrong, enough for a proper compensation

to the amount of their redemption, from them, or from others who belong to the state, whether it be Jewish or Turkish." The only real question is, if every Christian, without distinction, may purloin the goods of Turks. Azorius and Filliuccius say No, but, "with probability," Molina and Cajetan say Yes. So do Victorelli, Naldus, Du Vallius, Rebellus, Velasquez, Covarruvias, and others in Diana, who also holds it "probable." The reason is, that it may be rightly presumed that every Christian has this permission given him by Christian sovereigns, who have a right'—[hear it, O Nicholas!]'—'to despoil Turks of all their goods and of the territories usurped by them. Felix Potesta agrees in this, provided that (as he rightly limits it) there be not among the Turks a time of truce, or of safe-conduct, and provided that it do not apply to any single Turk living in Christian countries, whether free or a slave, especially if he is there as a public official under royal protection.'—L. iv. 525.

So much for purloining which is not thieving. We now proceed to venial thieving. 'Mortal sin,' the *Homo Apostolicus* says, 'is that which deprives man of divine grace, which is the life of the soul, and is therefore called mortal. Venial sin is that which does not deprive of grace, and does not diminish God's love towards us, but does diminish our love towards God.'¹ The distinction between mortal and venial sin being so enormous—venial sins being so trifling, that we are told a man does not sin gravely who deliberately determines to commit every venial sin under the sun—it is very important to see what are the conditions which bring acts under one class or the other.² That there are some sins less offensive to God, which, if we please, we may call venial, and some sins more offensive to God, which, if we please, we may call mortal, we do not deny; but it is clear that according to any system which is not wholly unspiritual, it must depend altogether upon the disposition of mind in which the sin is committed, whether it is light or grave; and that to lay down an abstract chart in which certain sins are dotted down as venial, and certain others as mortal, is intellectually ludicrous and morally unprincipled. Rome's theologians think otherwise. One of the chief purposes of such books as that which we are reviewing is to classify all acts as respectively venial and mortal. The rules by which these writers have to direct themselves in deciding between the two classes, are three:—All sins requiring advertence on the part of the intellect, and consent on the part of the will; a sin is not mortal unless the advertence be full and

¹ Hom. Apost. Tract. iii. 66. Vide *Christian Remembrancer*, No. LXXXIII. p. 44, for a further explanation of 'mortal and venial sin.'

² Does any Christian man sin gravely who determines to commit every venial sin? Sanchez and Bonacina say Yes, because, as S. Thomas teaches, venial sins naturally dispose towards mortal sin: but, "with greater probability," Palao and Antony of the Holy Ghost say No; (provided however that he does not act in contempt, and is not in proximate risk of falling into mortal sin, which he would learn from his past experience). The reason is, that really a purpose of this kind only conduces in a remote manner to mortal sin.—Theol. Mor. l. v. 12.

the consent be perfect. So far good: those two rules, if assailable on any other ground, are not liable to the charge of unspirituality. But there is a third: for a sin to be mortal there is also required 'gravity of matter;' and hard are the shifts to which those who try to divest Rome's morals of a hard, dry, calculating, mechanical character, are driven to explain what this 'gravity of matter' is. Sometimes they will say that it means 'the gravity of the sin;' but 'matter' and 'sin' are not the same thing; and Liguori, in so many words, distinguishes them. Sometimes they will say that it means 'the objective and material badness of the act.' This is less tenable than the former; and so at last they are compelled to acquiesce in the simple account given of it by all the commentators on S. Thomas Aquinas, and adopted from them by S. Alfonso. We will take Cardinal de Lugo's account, as representing the earlier writers. He says:—

'It is certain that in this (*i. e.* in stealing) a sin may be allowed to be light, not only on account of defect of advertence, but also on account of levity of matter. The whole difficulty is in determining how much matter is enough for a mortal sin of theft. . . . Though we can with certainty determine some matter to be small, viz. an obol or penny, and other matter to be certainly grave, viz. 20*l.*; yet between these two extremes we cannot define what approaches to each of these two matters, so as to be light if up to that sum, and grave if beyond it.'—*Lugo de Just.* d. 16. n. 27, 28.

The meaning, then, of gravity of matter in the case of theft is the amount stolen. If the amount stolen is equal to a certain quantity, which is called notable, then the theft is *in grave matter*, and (supposing that it is committed with full advertence and perfect consent), the act is a mortal sin. If it is below that quantity, then the theft is *in light matter*, and (in spite of full advertence and perfect consent) the act is a venial sin. S. Alfonso accordingly asks, on the subject of theft,—

'What is notable quantity for mortal sin?' . . . 'Various are the opinions on this subject. Navarrus, with too great scrupulousness, says that 2*½d.* is enough; others, with too great laxity, say 2*l.* 10*s.*; with greater moderation, Toletus, Medina, Lessius, &c. say 10*d.*, though less than that is enough, if it does notable damage.'—L. iv. 526.

These authors are but rough artists. As yet, we may observe, the attempt is to fix an *absolute* sum, settling at once (as one of three conditions) the spiritual price of each theft; viz. below 10*d.* purgatory, above 10*d.* eternal death. But what this absolute sum should be, it was difficult to decide. There is some difference between 2*l.* 10*s.* and 2*½d.*; nor does 10*d.* seem a fair medium between them. But by degrees the science grows more exact, and it is determined that the sum fixed must be *relative*, not absolute; and that it must be higher or lower, according to the circumstances of the person from whom the thief steals.

'What is grave quantity with respect to different sorts of persons, or to different circumstances?... The Doctors say "in common," that in theft that is grave matter which would be enough for a man to support himself and his family with for a day, according to their condition in life, counting, as Croix, Sporer, Gomez and others well note, not only his board, but also the price of his clothing and lodging. But as this rule is very obscure and confused, and cannot be applied to all without exception, we will bring forward the Doctors who fix what is grave matter for different kinds of persons.

'1. With respect to poor mendicants, Habert, Elbel, Sporer, and Holzmänn, fix on a few coins as grave matter. But others "more commonly" fix 5*d.*, or sometimes even 2*d.* (but rarely, as the Salamanca Doctors say). So Busembaum, Lessius, Bonacina, Viva, Anacletus, Escobar, Renzi, Mazzotta, Wigandt, with Bannez and Serra; so too Navarrus, Reginald, and Diana in Lugo.

'2. With respect to poor labourers, speaking generally, Layman and Lugo say that anything equal in value to a day's maintenance, or to the ordinary wages which are given to a labourer for a day, is grave matter. Others, however, speak more distinctly. Roncaglia and Habert fix 5*d.* for grave matter; but others "more commonly" say 10*d.*, both for labourers and artizans or mechanics. So Layman, Lessius, Medina, Bonacina, Viva, Wigandt, Concina, Renzi, Escobar, Mazzotta, Tamburini, Busembaum, Holzmänn, Serra in the Salamanca Doctors, and Navarrus, Reginald, and Diana in Lugo. Nevertheless, Soto, and Peter Navarrus in Lessius, require for artizans more than 10*d.* to make grave matter, and so Elbel and Potesta say; Filliucius requires 1*s.* 3*d.*, Lugo 1*s.* 8*d.* Hence I say with "probability," that 10*d.* is enough for labourers, but that for artizans at least 1*s.* 0*d.* is required for grave matter, if they earn as much or more a day. Habert, however, rightly notes that if a workman supported himself with difficulty, earning 7*d.* or 8*d.* a day, such an amount would be grave in regard to him.

'3. With respect to men rich in a common or ordinary way, men who live on their own income, Concina and Roncaglia fix 1*s.* 3*d.* for grave matter, Layman about 2*s.* 6*d.*; but "more commonly," Busembaum, Lessius, Bonacina, Gordon, Habert, Viva, Anacletus, with Peter Navarrus, Elbel, Tamburini, Holzmänn, Potesta, Wigandt, Bannez, Serra, Reginald, Diana, with the Salamanca Doctors, say that for these 1*s.* 8*d.* is grave matter. Nay, Filliucius, Escobar, Mazzotta, Renzi, and Tamburini extend it to 2*s.* 1*d.* Viva, however, rightly notices that this does not apply to men who live very closely, although they do live on their own income: in their case I certainly think 1*s.* 3*d.* is grave matter; nay even less in the case of those who keep themselves and their household in exceedingly wretched plight. On the other hand, for a person absolutely wealthy, Sporer requires 2*s.* 1*d.*, Lugo 2*s.* 6*d.* or 2*s.* 11*d.* But with regard to tradesmen of small fortune, I think that 1*s.* 0*d.* is grave matter. For others of moderate fortune, I think, with Elbel, Viva, Anacletus, and Croix, 1*s.* 8*d.* For a very rich tradesman Croix requires 3*s.* 4*d.* Tamburini, Renzi, and Potesta require 5*s.* But Layman, Elbel, Holzmänn, Angelus, Sylvester, Rodriguez, Peter of Aragon, Antony of Cordova in the Salamanca Doctors, require 2*s.* 1*d.*

'4. With respect to very rich noblemen, Sylvester, Angelus, Peter of Aragon, Antony of Cordova and Rodriguez in the Salamanca Doctors, require more than 10*s.* for grave matter; Viva, Elbel, Sporer and Croix, at least 10*s.*; but "more commonly" it is said that 5*s.* is enough for grave matter, by Bonacina, Gordon, Mazzotta, Filliucius, Anacletus, Tamburini, Lugo, Navarrus, Reginald, Diana, Lessius, Soto, Peter Navarrus, Roncaglia, Holzmänn. And Filliucius, Roncaglia, Holzmänn, and Lugo, say that this applies to kings too, because though, absolutely regarded, 5*s.* may seem light matter to them, yet really, they say, considering the burdens and functions of kings,

it is grave. The Salamanca Doctors say that 7*s.* 6*d.* at least, is enough for kings. Others however "probably" say that at least 10*s.* is required, as Croix, Bonacina, Busembaum, Sporer, Mazzotta, Elbel, Tamburini, Viva and Serra in the Salamanca Doctors. Nay, Potesta requires more than 10*s.* for kings, and very many others extend it to 15*s.*; as Wigandt, Bannez, Serra, Layman, Peter Navarrus, Angelus, Sylvester, Soto, Peter of Aragon, Rodriguez, Antony of Cordova, and the "common opinion," as Layman says.

5. With respect to a community, Sanchez and Cardenas in Croix, think that 5*s.* is always grave matter; but Croix says "probably," that if the community were very rich, grave matter might be extended further, so that it did not exceed 10*s.*

'Conclusion, and "more probable opinion." From all this I draw, in conclusion, what seems to me "more probable." 1. With respect to mendicants, I think that 5*d.* is grave matter, or still less, if any poor persons gain less per day by alms. 2. With respect to labourers and similar workmen, commonly speaking, 10*d.*; for artizans, 1*s.* 0*½d.* 3. With respect to ordinarily or moderately rich men, 1*s.* 8*d.*; and less for those who live in wretched plight or on their own goods; but for the absolutely rich, 2*s.* 1*d.* or 2*s.* 6*d.*; and I think the same for very opulent tradesmen. 4. With respect to very rich noblemen, 5*s.*; and I think the same for a very opulent community—at least for this, I think that 7*s.* 6*d.* is enough for grave matter. With respect to kings, 10*s.*—L. iv. 527, 528.

Is this morality or arithmetic? And what does it all mean? It means this. First, the principle is admitted that unless a certain quantity is stolen a sin of theft is not mortal. Then, as Cardinal Lugo says, comes the difficult task of fixing what this sum must be. At first an absolute sum was fixed for all cases, whether 2½*d.*, or 10*d.*, or 2*l.* 10*s.* It was soon seen that that would not do, and so the absolute sum was changed into a sum relative to the income of the sufferer. Still, however, more exactness was demanded, and men were accordingly divided into so many classes, and a certain sum affixed to each one of these classes. He who stole anything under the sum fixed for each class from any member of that class sinned venially; he who stole as much as the sum fixed sinned mortally. On the question, What should be the recognised scale of prices? we have seen that doctors have considerably disagreed. The last tariff, the one with which we have to do, is as follows:—

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
With respect to mendicants	0	5
With respect to labourers	0	10
With respect to artizans	1	0½
With respect to moderately rich men.	1	8
With respect to absolutely rich men	2	6
With respect to very rich noblemen	5	0
With respect to a very rich community.	7	6
With respect to kings	10	0 ¹

¹ In the same way that the theory of predication in Logic is supposed to be made more perfect by the quantification not only of the subject but also of the

Now mark the inexpressibly absurd consequences resulting from laying down scales of this nature. Let there be 2s. 6d. lying on the table—let a man with full knowledge that God's law forbids him to appropriate it, yet wilfully and deliberately steal it for present gratification, nay, let there be added in his mind a malicious feeling of hatred against the owner. Is it not clear that he has been guilty of as perfect an act of theft as could be committed? that in God's sight he is a malicious thief, and must bear his burden accordingly? *Distinguendum* answers Rome. We must first ask to whom that 2s. 6d. belonged. If it belonged to a mendicant, if it belonged to a labourer, if it belonged to an artizan, if it belonged to a moderately rich man or to an absolutely rich man, then it is true the sin of theft was mortal. But in case that it belonged to a very rich nobleman, a very rich community, or to a king, the character of the act is changed; two of the conditions of a mortal act of theft are fulfilled, but the third is wanting. True, the man's mind, soul, and spirit remain in exactly the same disposition, but he has not stolen enough. He is excused from mortal sin on the ground of levity of matter. He has but committed a venial act of theft, and for that God's love is not diminished towards him, though his own love towards God is dulled. He need not confess what he has done.

Again, suppose a man standing between a country squire and a rich peer. Let him be affected exactly in the same manner and degree towards each. Let him know and bear in mind that God has forbidden him to take what does not belong to him, but let him wilfully determine to do so. He puts out his right hand and steals 3s. from the peer. God's love is not thereby diminished towards him—it is a venial act of theft. He puts out his left hand and steals the same sum of 3s. from the squire. He has earned to himself eternal hell fires, and his soul is dead—it is a mortal act of theft.

Once more,—a man is sitting in a railway carriage,—the temptation comes upon him, and though he is aware of the wickedness of the act he filches 2s. from his neighbour's pocket. Has he sinned mortally or venially? He does not know. If his neighbour was an absolutely rich man he sinned venially; if a moderately rich man he sinned mortally. Purgatory and everlasting death are in the balance.

Such are some of the absurdities which the introduction of

predicate; so we think that the theory of notable quantity in Theft should be perfected by the sum fixed being made relative to the income of the Thief as well as of the sufferer. We should then have a very pretty and ingenious puzzle, which might be represented in a diagram, something after the fashion of the 'Scheme of Opposition' in Aldrich. Perhaps some of the commentators on S. Alfonso (already he has several) will take advantage of this suggestion.

the Quantitative Principle into morals produces. The date of such introduction we need scarcely say is that period at which the vicious system of modern casuistry was in its strength. That there is a hint of it or approach to it in S. Augustine, and the moralists of the early Church, it would be an insult to them and to Christianity to suppose. Nay, it is not found in S. Thomas Aquinas. The names referred to in the passage quoted from Liguori will show its origin. The cause of its introduction is mainly twofold; first it may be traced to that spirit of defining, materializing, and making tangible, which has so unhappily pervaded Roman theology, doctrinal and moral; and next to a false idea that theft was only so far and to such degree sinful as it harmed our neighbour more or less. The fallacy which makes this latter notion plausible is easily exposed. It is true that the wilful harm done to our neighbour adds another sin to the sin of theft; but the sinfulness of the latter is already complete in its own kind as soon as a man has consciously and wilfully appropriated any sum, however small, knowing at the time that such appropriation was contrary to God's law. For example, God has written in our hearts the moral law of justice, 'Thou shalt not take that which is not thine to take;' and upon it has founded the positive law in His Word, 'Thou shalt not steal.' A man is conscious of these laws, and aware that he is bound by them. In the midst of this consciousness his eye lights upon something which he covets. The temptation is too strong for him, and he stretches out his hand and takes it. The sinfulness of the act is perfect, and yet not a thought has come into his mind of the harm, greater or less, done or not done, to his neighbour. So far as the sin of theft goes, it is wholly unimportant whether the thing which he coveted and appropriated was worth 2*d.* or 200*l.* It is true that if it were worth 200*l.*, and if that 200*l.* had been gathered together by a poor man in the sweat of his brow, and was his all, and the thief was conscious of this, another offence would be added to that of theft. Had the rich man in Nathan's parable taken the ewe lamb from another rich man, still he would have been guilty of a perfect sin of plunder, though he would not have added to it the further aggravation of cruelty and hard-heartedness. As it was, he was guilty first of seizing that which was not his, so transgressing the law of justice, and then, concomitantly with that sin, and by the same act, he was guilty of a host of other iniquities, by which he transgressed the laws of charity and humanity. We need not say that, without any additions or aggravations, theft and plunder are in themselves deadly sins.

So in murder. The formal sinfulness of murder consists in transgressing the law of God written in our hearts and in his

Word, 'Thou shalt not take another's life.' 'Thou shalt do no murder.' The sin would be a perfect sin of murder, although good rather than harm should come to the sufferer. The harm done to the sufferer adds another sinfulness to the already mortal sin of murder.

We shall be met by the question, What, then, is a boy a thief who eats a turnip as he is passing through a field? Certainly not, in virtue of that act taken abstractedly. What we have maintained all along is, that the guilt of the act depends upon the frame of mind of the agent. A merry boy who lightly takes an apple from an orchard is not blameless, but he is not guilty of a serious act of theft. But *if* he took that apple or that turnip not thoughtlessly, or because it was an allowed thing, but with a firm conviction all the time that it was forbidden by God, and that he was transgressing his law in doing so, then it would be a grave sin. But, says Lessius, 'for a theft to be mortal, it is necessary that the quantity of matter be considerable: and this is clear, for *it is not possible* that taking any little thing such as an apple or a penny, can be deadly guilt.'¹ We, on the other hand, lay down no abstract rule. In every case we say it depends upon the disposition of mind of the agent.

We now return to some more of the consequences of making *notabilis quantitas furti*, a condition of a mortal sin of theft.

'Lessius, Trulenchius, and Villalobos, say, that in separate small thefts twice as much is needed for grave matter, *i.e.* if 1s. 8d. is grave matter of itself, 3s. 4d. is required for grave matter by small thefts. Holzmann requires the same quantity, if these petty larcenies are committed on different persons, and if they take place at considerable intervals, he requires three times as much. To us, however, it seems more fair, as others quoted by Elbel say, to hold that if the petty larcenies are committed on the same person at intervals, or on different persons at the same time, then as much, and half as much again, *i.e.* 2s. 6d., is requisite and enough for grave matter. But if both these things concur, namely, if they are committed on different persons and at different times, I think twice as much is needed, *i.e.* 3s. 4d. This however is to be understood with Lessius and Lugo, provided thefts are not purposely made in portions, and provided that there is not a long interval between the thefts. Layman, Bonacina, Lugo, &c. add, that petty larcenies do not coalesce if they are committed on different owners, and after a long interval, such as a year. Nay, Sanchez, Decian, Roncaglia, Viva, and Trulenchius, excuse from making restitution *sub gravi*, though the petty larcenies were committed on one owner, if there is an interval of a year. But Viva and Roncaglia reject the opinion of Filiuccius, Diana, Salaz, Vidal, Toletus, &c., who excuse from making restitution if fifteen days or a month have elapsed, as Navarrus in Sanchez admits: unless, excepts Viva, the matter is very small. Hence, I rather approve of Roncaglia's opinion, namely, that there must be at least an interval of two months, when the matter is, though not grave, yet very nearly grave.'—L. iv. 350.

¹ Lessius de Just. 2, 12, 13.

Thus we see that the category of Time, as well as the category of Quantity, is important in Rome's Theory of Theft. A disregard of a few days with respect to the period at which he commits his venial theft may perchance precipitate a man beyond the range of Purgatory. The next extract will show that the category of Place is equally worthy of the regard of an Italian disciple.

'It is asked, Is it mortal to steal a little piece of a sacred relic? No one doubts that it is mortal in the Roman district, as Clement VIII. and Paul V. have excommunicated those who steal the very smallest relics against the will of the Rectors of the Churches. But it is not, (as Croix says "probably" with Sanchez, Bonacina, Castropalao, Diana, and Bardellus,) if, *outside the district*, a man steals some very little thing, the loss of which does not disfigure the relic or diminish its value—unless it be some remarkable or rare relic, as part of the Holy Cross, or of the Hairs of the Blessed Virgin Mary, &c.'—L. iv. 532.

'If a man on an occasion arising, only steals a little, whether from one or from more, not intending to acquire much himself, nor to do great harm to his neighbour by his several thefts, he does not sin gravely, nor do all these taken together constitute one mortal sin: but after a notable quantity has been reached, he may sin mortally by keeping it.'—L. iv. 533.

'It is enough for avoiding mortal sin, that only that little matter be restored which makes up the grave matter, as is more probably held by Sanchez, Lessius, Vasquez, Rebellus, Bonacina, &c., with Croix; against Medina, Lopez, Esparsa, &c.'—L. iv. 553.

'But if a man has the intention of gradually enriching himself by a number of little thefts, committed on one or many, or of doing great harm, he sins gravely in that intention; and though each act is only venial in itself, yet, as it subserves to such an intention, it is on the whole the commission of a mortal sin, because men do grave damage to the community, and that practice is very pernicious to human society, *e.g.* if a tailor purloin a little piece of cloth from different persons; or if tradesmen use too short measures, &c. (Mark here the proposition condemned by Innocent XI. 'No one is bound under penalty of mortal sin to restore what has been taken away by small thefts, however great the total may be.') Meantime they [*i.e.* the tailors, tradesmen, &c.] are sometimes excused from grave sin. 1. From what has been said above. 2. If they act as they do for the sake of indemnifying themselves, or because they would otherwise make no profits, or because they ought to raise their price, and then would not find customers. 3. If otherwise they have not means of supporting themselves and those belonging to them.'—L. iv. 533.

In the above extract we have an instance of the method so frequently, not to say constantly adopted, by our author, of laying down a good principle, and then eating out the heart of it by exceptions broad enough to cover every case. It will be seen that almost any tailor might justify himself in purloining little pieces of cloth, and almost any tradesman in using too short measures.

'If a man, after having taken enough to make grave matter, steals some other little thing again, Lugo, Croix, Sporer, Decian, &c., think it is a

mortal sin every time the pilfering takes place. But Lessius and the Salamanca Doctors, with Tapia and Diana, say that a light theft of this sort does not make a mortal sin, unless it amount afresh to another grave quantity. And this Bonacina rightly thinks "very probable."—L. iv. 538.

Before bidding farewell to 'grave and small matter,' we must trace it in a few words into other branches of morals, and see how widely the Quantitative Principle extends, and what strange confusions it produces.

In oath-breaking:—

'It is certain that if you only fail in keeping a little of what you have sworn, it is not a grave sin; *e.g.* if you have sworn that you will not drink wine, you do not sin mortally by drinking a little, for then the smallness of matter is an excuse.'—L. iv. 173.

In working on Sundays:—

'What is gravity of matter in this? Some canonists quoted by Suarez fix one-third of the day for grave matter; but this opinion is commonly rejected. Others, again, with too great rigour, fix one hour. Others fix for grave matter two hours, as Roncaglia, Sanchez, Trulenchius, the Salamanca Doctors, Palao, Elbel, and Holzmänn: and Sporer, Mazzotta, and Marchantius, call this the common opinion. Henno thinks so too, if the work is very servile, such as breaking stones or digging, but in other cases he requires three hours. But others, speaking generally, require for grave matter (and not without "probability") at least two, and rather more than two hours, as Viva, &c., with Tamburini, who says that this is now the received opinion in our age. Others, as Marchantius and Gobat, require three hours. Basembaum, likewise with Filliucci, says that it is hard to condemn working for two or three hours as mortal sin. Croix agrees, and concludes that it is now the "more common, and more probable opinion," that it is not mortal, unless the work continues at least a good deal more than two hours, say two hours and a half.'—L. iv. 305.

In failing to hear Mass:—

'What omission is a grave sin? There are different opinions. The first says it is grave to omit from the beginning to the Epistle exclusively. . . . The second to the Epistle inclusively. . . . The third to the Gospel inclusively. . . . Although the Creed be omitted. . . . It is the "common" opinion that a man does not sin gravely who omits everything after the reception, nor even one who omits at the same time everything before the Epistle and everything after the reception.'—L. iv. 310.

In being at a distance from the Altar:—

'May Mass be heard by a man who looks at the altar out of his own house on the other side of the street? Sporer, Lugo, Decian, Gobat, &c. in Croix, say Yes; and this, not without "probability," is admitted by Mazzotta, Elbel, Escobar, and very many more, if the distance is small, because then he is, morally, sufficiently present. Lugo and Escobar say that a distance of sixty feet is not an obstacle, but Tamburini and Gobat do not allow that.'—L. iv. 312.

In fast-breaking, Pasqualigo holds half an ounce to be small matter. The Salamanca Doctors, on the contrary, confine it to

the eighth part of an ounce.¹ In omitting to say office, three Doctors think that half, or the third part, of a small 'hour' is notable matter, but this is denied by thirteen other Doctors; fourteen Doctors hold that anything less than the whole of a small hour is light matter; five Doctors maintain that the whole of the vespers on Easter-eve may on this ground be omitted without grave sin.² In failing to say Mass at the right hour, Azorius thinks twenty minutes to be grave matter; Layman half-an-hour; the more general opinion is anything under an hour.³

'In talking to nuns is smallness of matter allowed? De Alessandro thinks not; but the common opinion is on the other side. But authors differ in fixing what is small matter in such talking. Ciera thinks a few words; Merolla thinks ten words; Diana and Mazzotta the length of a *Miserere* and a little more; Quarti and Vericelli say a quarter of an hour. . . Nor is Quarti's opinion condemned by Clement the IXth's Decree. . . for the only opinion there condemned was that a quarter of an hour and half a quarter of an hour was small matter.'—L. vii. 236.

Such as these are the rules to which men are reduced when they ignore the true character of man's conscience, and forget that machines must be regulated in one way, and God's creatures, with God-given instincts of right and wrong, in another. We now pass on to the limited liberty granted to wives, children, and servants, to steal from their husbands, fathers, and masters. And let no one think that we are selecting an invidious term in employing the expression 'steal.' *Furari*, *surripere*, and *furta* are the words freely and innocently used by S. Alfonso. *Furari* we translate by *steal*, *surripere* by *purloin*, and *accipere* by *take*.

We have already seen that a wife may, without any fault, take money from her husband, to prevent him from spending it on bad objects; may carry his wine away, that he may not drink too much; and make away with his heretical books, that he may not read them. Further:

'A wife may give alms and gifts according to the custom of other women of her position and station, although her husband forbid her to give any alms, because custom allows her this right and her husband cannot deprive her of it. So says Lugo, "in common" with Molina, Lessius, Concina, Bonacina, Reginald, &c. in Diana, the last of whom, with Molina and ten others, teaches that, without letting her husband know anything about it, she may give the twentieth part of the income which he has, or of the profits which he makes, because it belongs to the respectability of her position to do so, and it would be unreasonable for her husband to be unwilling. (But Lugo, Sporer, Tamburini, and Croix, do not allow this when expressed so universally.) It follows also, that a wife may, with Abigail, give moderate alms to gain the conversion of her husband, or that God

¹ L. iv. 1029.² L. v. 147.³ L. vi. 346.

may not punish him. Vasquez, Bonacina, Reginald, and ten others; against Concina.'—L. iv. 540.

'A wife commits no sin in secretly subtracting (*subducendo*) some things; whether by way of compensation, if her husband is an expensive man (because then he wrongs the wife by wasting her share,) or for food, dress, and the other necessities for herself and the household, which husbands often don't understand, and it would be of no use to ask them.'—L. iv. 541.

'If a wife's father, mother, or children by another marriage are poor, so as to be living wretchedly according to their station, and her husband will not help them, she may supply them out of her own goods; or, as well, out of the common goods (provided that after her husband's death she reckons the sum spent to her own share,) because she is bound by the law of nature to keep them, and her husband to allow her to do so. Navarrus, Palao, Lessius, Diana. The latter extends this right to the support of brothers and sisters, which Lessius and Trulenchius also think "probable," with Lugo, Molina, Sanchez, &c.'—L. iv. 542.

We will exemplify this case. A gentleman, has, we will say, 20,000*l.* a year. He marries a wife, who is, or becomes, a faithful adherent of Rome, and consequently, thenceforth, has her conduct governed, through her Director, by S. Alfonso de' Liguori's Theory of Morals. Now, if the gentleman were given to racing and to drinking, we do not think that the best method of reclaiming him would be for his wife to lay hands on his money, in order to prevent him from spending it to his own harm or disadvantage. This, however, she might do if she liked (L. iv. 519). But we will not suppose him addicted to such pursuits. We will picture him to ourselves as a high-bred English gentleman. First then, he must look after his library, for any books which are placed upon the Index are in danger (L. iv. 519). And next he must make up his mind to various other losses, small and great, and all of them taking place in a mysterious and underhand manner, for his lady does not exercise her privileges openly.

Her great right, with which we will begin, is 1000*l.* per annum, to be taken from her husband's goods, without his knowledge, and bestowed in what is generally called charity, *i.e.* pious works pointed out by her Director. This 1000*l.* a-year must not be supposed to be her allowance from her husband, or property belonging to herself (which Liguori sets apart under the head of *dotalia* and *paraphernalia*): it is five per cent. on 'her husband's annual income,' and she is to get it, and give it away—this is the point to which we call especial attention—without her husband knowing anything about it—*in scio marito*. If she should be asked any troublesome questions, or if her conscience should become uneasy, the questions are answered and her conscience is quieted by the argument, that it would not be respectable and befitting her station if she did not give away 1000*l.* a-year in charity; and so, if her husband were unwilling that

she should do so, it would be unreasonable in him; and according to the very definition of theft, if the owner is unreasonable in his dislike at having his goods taken away, there can be no stealing—*Hoc pertinet ad decentiam statûs, et maritus irrationabiliter est invitus . . . Furtum est occulta et injusta rei alienæ ablatio, invito rationabiliter domino.* And how is this 1000*l.* a-year to be spent?—In alms and gifts. One special method of almsgiving is suggested 'to gain her husband's conversion, or that God will not punish him,' *i.e.* Masses for his conversion and for his soul. We doubt if the kind purpose here displayed would soften the loss of the 1000*l.* to the husband. We are not sure, indeed, whether the sum spent on Masses, with this object, is not an additional 'gift' exclusive of the 1000*l.*; at all events but a part of the latter could well be spent in it. The price of Masses differs in different countries, and for different classes; the usual price advertised in the *Esperanza*, and other Spanish newspapers, is 2*s.* In Florence we found the general charge to be two pauls; and in the South of Italy the lowest price is a carlino, or 5*d.* In each place a tariff is to be laid down, says Liguori, by the Ordinary. However high it should be fixed, yet it could not swallow up any considerable part of the 1000*l.* per annum; though we doubt not that a priest might thus find sufficient support to maintain him while occupied in converting his patroness's husband's tenants—and then there is the Chapel to be built. In one way or another the whole of this 1000*l.* is to be given away every year.

The next thing which the wife has to do is to make up her mind whether her husband is more expensive and wasteful than he ought to be; if she determines that he is, she may 'secretly subtract some things' in order to make compensation to herself for the injury which she is told is thus done to her.

Thirdly, she may 'secretly subtract some things' for food, dress, and household necessities, which her husband would not allow her if she asked him; for husbands don't understand those things.

Fourthly, we must suppose that her father and mother are alive, that she has four or five brothers and sisters, and some children of her own by a previous marriage. Some reverses have fallen upon them, and they are no longer able to live in the style of gentlemen and ladies, as they have been used to do. She goes to her husband and asks him to help them. The husband, feeling perhaps the loss of the 1000*l.* and the other 'subtractions,' refuses, *non vult succurrere.* Then says Liguori, in his *Homo Apostolicus*, 'She may take something from the goods 'which belong to them both in common, or indeed from those 'which belong especially to her husband—enough for them to

'live according to their station—although her husband is repugnant to it, for his repugnance is irrational.' This will be another very serious item in the husband's expenses: seven or eight persons cannot be supported in the station of gentlemen and ladies for nothing. We think it must be put down at another 1000*l.* per annum.

On the other hand, she must cook the dinner and sweep the house, if her husband tells her, according to the opinion of some Doctors. 'Is a noble wife bound to fulfil menial offices at her husband's command, such as cooking the dinner and sweeping the house? Angelus, Tiraquellus, &c. say she must.' Others, however, are of a different opinion, and make the consolatory remark, that if the wife did such works she might compensate herself, *i. e.* take as much more of her husband's goods as would serve for a cook's or housemaid's wages. 'Sanchez, the Salamanca Doctors, with Sylvius, Garcias, Fagundez, &c., "with greater probability," say she need not, because the wife is a companion, and therefore is not bound to perform the works of a servant, which would be a disgrace to her; and if she did perform them herself, she might make compensation to herself, as they say.'¹

Moreover, the husband 'may sometimes chastise moderately with words, and on grave cause with moderate blows, if he has regard for her condition and station,' but must not 'beat her heavily.' It appears too that, on the authority of Sanchez, Surdus, &c., he may starve her if her dowry has not been paid: the more general opinion however would only justify him in maintaining her in the same style in which he keeps his servants.

'Is the husband bound to keep or support (*alere*) his wife if her dowry has not been paid? The Doctors in common say No, if it is the fault of the promiser that it has not been paid. So Sanchez, Bonacina, Bossius, the Salamanca Doctors, Fagundez, Trulenchius and others, saying that the object of the dowry is that the husband may keep his wife with it. Except, however, 1, if the husband married without a dowry being promised, and, 2, if the wife pays obedience to her husband, for then he is at least bound to keep her like a servant. So say the Salamanca Doctors, with Abbas, Lupo, &c., quoted by Sanchez. Sanchez, however, with Surdus and others, does not allow the second exception, because (as he says) the wife is bound to pay her husband both a dowry and obedience, and therefore it is not necessary for him to maintain her if she only pays obedience. But I rather adhere to the opposite opinion, because the law of nature itself teaches you to keep one who occupies himself in being your servant.'—*L. vi.* 939.

Still he must take care how he behaves, for, since the conversion of his wife, the continuance of his marriage is entirely at

¹ *L. li.* 352.

² *L. li.* 356.

the mercy of the neighbouring Roman Catholic Bishop—it may be, the very Director who arranges how the 1,000*l.* shall be bestowed in works of piety. It is no longer lawful for his wife to live with him except by the dispensation of the Bishop. The second of the four causes which justify divorce, *quoad vinculum* in Roman Theology, is the fact of one of the two being converted to the faith. On this head a question is asked, ‘If the ‘unbeliever will not be converted, but still wishes to live peaceably without wrong towards the Creator, may the faithful one ‘separate from him not only *quoad torum* but also *quoad vinculum*?’ To this three answers are given. The first absolutely in the negative, which is held by S. Paul; the second absolutely in the affirmative, which is held by Bellarmine:

‘The third is the “more common and more probable” opinion, held by Sanchez, Concina, Pontius, Tournely, and others, which says that *in old days* the believing wife might not go away from her husband and proceed to another marriage, unless there were danger of her perversion, because there was no cause for her leaving her unbelieving husband, for very many unbelievers were converted to the faith by miracles, which were then much more commonly worked by the faithful; *but now-a-days*, when so great a frequency of miracles has ceased, it is made unlawful to live with an unbelieving husband by the received custom of the Church, which has been introduced from experience having taught that there is no little risk of perversion from living with an unbeliever—except the Bishop gives a dispensation for living with him from probable hope of his conversion. We must however mark with S. Thomas, Concina and Petrocorensis, that the marriage is not broken till the believer has left her husband and proceeded to another marriage. And also that before the believing one contracts another marriage, she ought to warn the unbelieving one, to see if he will be converted to the faith, as Gregory XIII. and S. Pius V. commanded. Sanchez however says that this need not be done if it is certain that the unbeliever is obstinate or if he is very far off. Croix notices that in case the unbelieving one cannot be warned, the Pontiff’s dispensation is required, as, he says, the aforesaid Gregory XIII. has commanded.’—L. vi. 957.

Besides the four methods of divorce *quoad vinculum*—by death—by the conversion of one of the two—by entering a monastery within two months after marriage, and before consummation—by Papal dispensation under certain circumstances;—

¹ It may suggest itself to our readers that the word *infidelis*, ‘unbeliever,’ here used, can mean only the heathen, and not be applicable to those whom Rome calls heretics as well. This however is not so. For not to mention that the contradictory to *infidelis* here employed is not *Christianus*, but *Catholicus*, and to put out of sight the fact that the Rev. F. W. Faber, in his Essay on Missions, has declared for himself and his co-religionists that it is a point of sound theology to hold all Englishmen not in communion with Rome, and all Protestants, to be ‘infidels,’ we have S. Alfonso’s own definition of what he means by *infidelis*. ‘*Infidelitas* or unbelief,’ he says, ‘is of three kinds. The first *negative*, of men who have never heard anything about the faith.... The second *contrary*, of those who despise or obstinately contradict the faith when it has been sufficiently brought before them, as the *heretics*. The third *privative*.... Unbelief termed *contrary* is also threefold, viz. Paganism.... Judaism.... Heresy.’—L. iii. 17.

² Or ‘husband,’ throughout.

there are also six methods of divorce, *quoad torum*. The first is that which proceeds on our Lord's precept, unless it be for fornication.' The second is ill-treatment, which Liguori says has been introduced by the authority of the Church.¹ The third is 'if one entices the other to sin, for example, solicits her 'to become a heretic, to deal in witchcraft. &c.: for then the 'innocent one is allowed, nay is bound to separate if the danger 'is serious.' The fourth is a contagious disease, like leprosy.³ The fifth, heresy or apostasy, arising after marriage, for 'a wife 'may go away from an heretical husband, though his heresy is 'secret, nay, she is bound to do so, if she is in danger of being 'perverted.'⁴ The sixth is mutual consent.⁵

Liguori, in qualifying a liberty of dispensation with regard to marriage, allowed to the Pope by Busembaum, Sanchez, Bellarmine, Navarrus, the Salamanca Doctors, Cajetan, Vasquez, Bonacina, Rebellus, Becanus, &c., expresses a fear that if it were allowed, few marriages could stand firm.⁶ We think that without this liberty, there are few which might not be overthrown by the ten methods of divorce enumerated above; the more as

¹ L. vi. 970.

² L. vi. 973.

³ L. vi. 973.

⁴ L. vi. 794. A marriage, however, originally contracted with a 'heretic,' is valid, though illicit. 'To contract a marriage with a heretic, though it is a thing unlawful in itself, and is held to be a mortal sin in Spain and Italy, is yet probably allowable, owing to the authority of grave doctors, in Germany, if there is a grave cause for it, with a *salvo* however for natural law, and provided that there is no danger either to the contracting party or to the children; settlements ought to be made at the beginning with regard to the children, that they should be brought up as Catholics.'—L. iii. 19. And again, 'Marriage with heretics is, generally speaking, forbidden by the Church, but it is very probable that where heretics and Catholics live mixed together, as in Germany, Poland, &c., it is allowable from received and tolerated custom to marry heretics, provided that, 1, the Catholic may freely remain in the faith; 2, there is no danger of perversion; 3, the children are allowed to be brought up as Catholics; 4, it is not easy to find a partner among Catholics. But if any one of these conditions is wanting, it is not allowable; as Croix rightly says.'—L. vi. 56. We find too that 'His Holiness Pope Benedict XIV. grieves over Catholics who do not from their soul abhor those detestable marriages which holy mother Church has always condemned.'—L. vi. 1044.

⁵ L. vi. 975.

⁶ 'But the second opinion says Yes, [i. e. that the Pope can free a *vinculo*, in the case of a marriage celebrated but not consummated,] and is held by Busembaum, Sanchez, Bellarmine, Navarrus, the Salamanca Doctors, Cajetan, Vasquez, Concina, Bonacina, Rebellus, Becanus, &c., on the grounds that Pontiffs have made it customary by very often dispensing after a marriage has been celebrated, as Navarrus and Cajetan declare of their own knowledge, and also because the Chief Pontiff, as Christ's Vicar entrusted with the government of the Church, may very well dispense, when he has a good reason, even in things which are *de jure divino*, and concern human actions. And, as the afore-named authors say, a good reason would be *impotentia superveniens*, or scandal impending, or barrenness lately discovered, when the public good requires that children should be born. They add also disparity of condition, a contagious disease, dissensions being foreseen, and mutual consent, but Concina does not allow these last four reasons, and he is right, at least unless the necessity of the public good require their being acted on: for otherwise if they were admitted, few marriages could stand firm.'—L. vi. 959. This, it will be observed, is *quoad vinculum*, not only *quoad torum*.

we find that there are twenty-one impediments of marriage, six only of which make it unlawful, but still valid; while the other fifteen make it absolutely null, *although it has been celebrated*.¹

We now proceed to the right of sons in stealing from their fathers:—

‘Salaz says, in Croix, that a son’s theft of 5*l.* or 7*l.* 10*s.* is not grave, if his father has 375*l.* a-year; and Lugo does not find fault with this statement, if the father is not close, and if the son is grown up, and takes it for honest purposes. Lessius, Navarrus. and Filliuccius in Sporer, say that a son does not sin gravely in stealing 10*s.* or 15*s.* from a rich father. Bannez says, that for a grave theft by the son of a very rich father, at least 12*l.* 10*s.* is required; but Lugo and La Croix reject this, unless it were the son of a *principe*. Holzmann agrees in this; he says, too, that it is not grave to take 2*l.* 10*s.* from a very rich father. Navarrus, Soto. Layman, &c., allow that if a son is engaged in study, and his father sends him 25*l.*, the son may spend 1*l.* 5*s.* in honest recreations, on the presumed consent of his father.’—L. iv. 543.

‘If the son, say, of a tradesman or an innkeeper, manages his father’s goods, he may require his father to give him a salary as large as he would give to a man who was no relation; and if he cannot get it, or does not venture to ask for it, he may take it clandestinely. So, “with probability,” Layman, Diana.’—*Ibid.*

Some of the other duties of parents and sons towards each other are given in the few next extracts:—

‘Parents sin gravely if, without good reason, they expose their offspring in a hospital or in public places: but the child’s being illegitimate is a good reason, as Layman, Diana, Henriquez, and the Salamanca Doctors say. . . . Hospitals of this kind are instituted for the assistance not only of the poor, but also of the rich in danger of disgrace; for then they are used to procure abortion or kill their child to avoid loss of character. Now, this is the evil which hospitals are intended to meet; nay, I say, they are erected rather for spurious children than for the poor, for the purpose of freeing the former from the danger of death, eternal and temporal, which they would be likely to undergo, through fear of disgrace, if the parents had to keep them of their own cost.’—L. iv. 336, 656.

‘A father must support both his legitimate and illegitimate children. . . . And ecclesiastics may keep their spurious children out of their clerical revenue.’—L. iv. 336.

‘A son sins gravely against reverence, if he despises his parents for being poor, and will not acknowledge them. But still, if he only outwardly dissembles his knowledge of them, and will not have them with him, for good

¹ I. Ecclesiæ vetitum, II. necnon tempus feriarum, III. Atque Catechismus, IV. Crimen, V. Sponsalia, VI. Votum, Impediunt fieri, permittunt facta teneri.
I. Error, II. Conditio, III. Votum, IV. Cognatio, V. Crimen, VI. Cultûs disparitas, VII. Vis, VIII. Ordo, IX. Ligamen, X. Honestas, XI. Ætas, XII. Affinis, XIII. Si clandestinus, XIV. et Impos, XV. Raptave sit mulier nec parti reddita tutæ,
Hæc socianda vetant connubia, *facta reractant*.—L. vi. 982, 1008.

reason, Bonacina excuses him from grave sin so that he provides them with necessities, because it is not reasonable for them to be unwilling that he should so act. Hence, "with probability," Azorius, Navarrus, Toletus, and Trulenchius excuse the son who does this, from mortal sin, in the following cases:—1. If he would suffer grave harm. 2. If his parents bear the stigma of a disgraceful crime. 3. If he only outwardly dissembles, and has not inward contempt, because then the parents themselves are not supposed to be gravely or reasonably unwilling.—L. iv. 334.

'Sporer says, absolutely, that if a son curses his' parents, or mocks at them, he is not excused from mortal sin, whether he does it in their presence or their absence. I do not know how this author, who is moderate enough in his other opinions, and perhaps sometimes over-indulgent, could make this assertion so absolutely; for, as he confesses himself, and every one teaches, no harm is done to reverence or respect but by insult offered in a man's presence, or if it be in his absence, with the purpose of its coming to his knowledge. And besides, there is the argument which is used by very many grave Doctors, who say that sacrilege is not committed, and a Church is not polluted, by fornication in it, provided it be committed secretly, on the grounds which Coninchius gives, that due respect to a Church, like character, consists in the opinion of men; consequently, as men do not lose their character unless their crimes are made public, so the reverence of a holy place is not violated unless the crime is publicly known. However it may be about this opinion, (which is "quite probable," as the Salamanca Doctors say, though the opposite appears to me "more probable," because of the irreverence to God, who is specially present in a Church, and sees everything which is secret,) what I am concerned with is the reason which they bring forward; viz. that no harm is done to reverence but by an open manifestation of insult. How then can a son sin gravely when he curses his father without his knowing it, or mocks at him behind his back, inasmuch as, in that case, there is neither insult nor irreverence? And I think that the same is to be said, even though he does this before others. Still I do not deny that there is in it a sort of slight which is opposed to due filial reverence, and a special *malitia contra pietatem continentem*, but it does not reach to mortal sin, except in case the son cursed them with malevolent meaning, or with great contempt; for example, if he should curse them in the presence of others, with the purpose of their carrying it to his parents, or supposing they would carry it.

'Now Viva, Elbel, Tamburini, Mazzotta, Bonacina, and others, say that a son sins gravely in cursing his parents, whether they are alive or dead. But the afore-named authors, with somewhat too great inconsiderateness, do not explain whether they speak of curses uttered with malevolent meaning or not. And yet it must be altogether understood that he does not sin gravely if he curses them without such design. And indeed Navarrus and Filliuccius, whom Bonacina cites for his doctrine, do understand it so; for Navarrus says that a son sins who curses his parent, *and means it*, whether his parent is dead or alive; but if he only curses them with his tongue, it is no more than a venial offence. And this Filliuccius confirms in almost the same words.—L. iv. 334.

To return to the case of the gentleman whose wife we have represented as acting upon the approved principles of Roman moral theology, and see how he would fare with his children.

The tariff by which sons are to steal from their fathers is as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
The son of a rich nobleman may venially steal .	12	10	0
The son of a man worth 37 <i>l.</i> a year from 5 <i>l.</i> to	7	10	0
The son of a very rich man	2	10	0
The son of a rich man from 10 <i>s.</i> to	0	15	0

This does not seem a very fair scale of prices, but we must take it as it stands.

An English gentleman with 20,000*l.* per annum, whether noble or not, is, we need scarcely say, more than equal in position to an Italian *principe*. The sum therefore which each of his sons may steal from him without grave sin is 12*l.* 10*s.*, and the interval which we have seen must elapse between two acts of venial theft is two months. The whole sum, therefore, which each son may venially steal, in the course of the year, is 75*l.* If he has six or seven sons this will take away another 500*l.* per annum from his income, besides what is more precious than gold or silver, what cannot be counted by money, but which a father's feelings could appreciate and a Christian's heart weep over.

But the father is now growing old, and he hands over the management of his estates to his eldest son. The right of claiming a salary, in such a case, is not confined to the sons of tradesmen and innkeepers, as might appear from the passage which we have extracted above. Any son may do so according to Navarrus, Lessius, Angelus, Lopez, Layman, and Busembaum, though Molina, Sanchez, and Croix think otherwise. Cardinal de Lugo and Liguori make a distinction, and say that the profits which he makes belong to his father,¹ but that if the trouble to which he is put is very great, he may quite well ask for a salary. And according to the same Doctors, 'The son is not 'to be presumed to have given up his claim to his salary, if from 'reverence to his father he refuses to *ask* for it: in that case 'however he must subtract what he costs his father for his 'keep.'² The euphemistic method of expression here used is highly praiseworthy, but, as we have seen, it is in the analogous case of the tradesman's son expressed more plainly—*potest clam accipere*—'he may take it clandestinely.' Here therefore is the mysterious loss of several more hundreds to the gentleman whose unhappy fortunes we have been tracing.

The son's right of pretending not to know his father, and refusing openly to acknowledge him, would not be called into

¹ This, however, is only if he acts in his father's name; 'but,' say Lugo and Molina, 'the profits belong to *him* if he engages in business in his own name, suppose that he has stolen the money from his father, or the money was 'esting idle in his father's hands.'—Theol. Mor. l. iv. 488. 3.

² L. iv. 488. 3.

exercise in the present case: but the privilege of cursing him might. We have seen that S. Alfonso becomes almost eloquent in maintaining that it is only venial in him, provided he curses him behind his back: he may do it before other people, so that he does not do it with the purpose of its getting round to his father's ears. And, besides, it is not grave sin, unless he intends the imprecation which he utters really to take effect; otherwise, *si ore tenus tantum maledixerit*, it is also venial. In like manner, in another passage, we are told that to curse the devil is seldom a mortal, and not often even a venial, sin.¹ That to use the words *Blood of God! Body of God!* in anger towards man, but without direct indignation against God, is not blasphemous²—that *God's Death! God's Wounds!* similarly used, and without scandal or circumstances which imply contempt, are serious instances of venial sins³—that it is only venial to utter an imprecation on a man, '*The devil seize you!*' so that it was not meant.⁴ A long dissertation is introduced to prove that cursing the dead is not mortal, and Liguori utters a most earnest ejaculation 'that all Confessors and Preachers would anxiously take care to 'instruct rude people on that point!''⁵ How soon this privilege of venially cursing their parents is allowed to children does not appear. In the *Praxis Confessarii*, the Confessor is desired to use the utmost affection and the sweetest manners possible to boys—*modos suaviores quantum fieri potest*—and then, after their confession, to inquire—1. Whether they have omitted telling anything from shame. 2. Whether they have blasphemed against the Saints or 'Saints' Days, or taken a lying oath.⁶ 3. Whether they have omitted to hear Mass on festivals. 4. Whether they have been disobedient to their parents, or shewn irreverence towards them, by mocking at them, or making long noses at them, or uttering abusive words and imprecations in their presence.⁷ And it seems that for sons to call their parents to their faces drunkards, beasts, fools, robbers, wizards, scoundrels, is mortal; but that calling them old fellows, ignorants, stupids, &c., may be venial.⁸

The son, on the other hand, must recollect that he sins gravely 'if, without good reason, such as inequality of birth, ill-health,

¹ L. iv. 129. ² L. iv. 124. ³ L. iv. 128. ⁴ L. iv. 131. ⁵ L. iv. 130.

⁶ Not, it will be observed, whether they have told a lie, but *an juraverint cum mendacio*.

⁷ *Prax. Conf. cap. vii. 90.*

⁸ *Prax. Conf. cap. ii. 34.* Another piece of advice in thus sweetly dealing with boys is observable; 'Let the Confessor, too, take the greatest care to insinuate into boys' minds devotion towards the Mother of God, (*curet magnoperè pueris insinuare devotionem erga Deiparam*) and get them to recite the Rosary every day, and the *Ave* three times morning and evening, always adding this prayer, "My mother, free me from mortal sin!"—*Cap. vii. 91.* Rome knows how to make use of the waxen youth of boys, and does make use of it unscrupulously.

'ugliness, stupidity, immorality, he will not marry the wife that 'his parent wishes, especially if quarrels would be so lulled, or 'the parents' necessities lightened.'" In case, however, that he wishes to enter Holy Orders, or to go into a Monastery, he is not to be so careful of their wishes, for, 'if he sees that his 'parents will unjustly hinder him, he will act most wisely by 'concealing the matter from them, and performing the divine 'will.'" 'Relatives must be altogether removed from a discussion on a religious vocation, says S. Thomas, for on that matter 'relations are not friends but enemies.'³

Our view of a Liguorian household must now conduct us to the kitchen department.

'Servants commit no sin if their master refuses them their just keep or wages, and they make secret compensation to themselves, provided that there is no other way of getting it, and they do not take more than is owed, and there is no fear of scandal or other grave discomfort.'—L. iv. 319.

'In the same way Navarrus and Lessius teach that they may make themselves compensation out of their master's goods, if it cannot be otherwise obtained, for services which they have performed without being bound to do so, if they did them, not *gratis* and liberally, but intending to be paid.'—*Ibid.*

'May a servant who works without any settled wages ask for or secretly purloin (*occulte surripere*) his just pay, at least the lowest which is customary? *Distingue.* If it is the master's custom to pay servants like him, he may: not otherwise, when, for example, noblemen or bishops are asked to take boys into their household; for in that case it is enough for the master to give them board, clothing, and lodging, such being the custom.'—L. iv. 348.

'May a servant, more than three years after he has left his master, ask for his salary and secretly make compensation to himself? Yes, say Sanchez, the Salamanca Doctors, Molina, Fagundez, Villalobos, and others.'—L. iv. 347.

'A man does not steal if he takes by way of just compensation, and cannot otherwise get what is due to him; *e.g.* if a servant cannot otherwise obtain just wages, or has been unfairly induced to undertake the place for an unfair price.'—L. iv. 521.

'But may a servant being himself quite sure of the justice of his payment make himself this compensation of his own private judgment? Croix, Cardenas, and Viva say No, professing that no servant, nor any one else employed for money, ought to make himself compensation, except upon the "most common judgment" of men who are skilled, or of a man very learned and engaged on Morality; and so they say that the judgment of a Confessor of but ordinary learning is not enough. But the Salamanca Doctors say, that a servant may, of his own private judgment, make himself compensation for his work, if his judgment is clear that he deserves higher pay. And this appears "quite probable" to me and other learned moderns, if the servant or person employed is a prudent man, cautious (*timoratus*), and really fit to judge right, and is quite sure of the justice of the compen-

¹ L. iv. 335.

² L. iv. 355.

³ Hom. Apost. xiii. 24.

sation without any danger of hallucination. But this is very seldom the case. And the 37th proposition condemned by Innocent XI. is no obstacle, for that proposition was rightly condemned because it spoke in too general terms.'—L. iv. 524.

Once again we find Innocent XI. attempting to put a stop to all this, and once more we find him foiled in his Jansenism.

'Mark here,' says Liguori, 'the proposition condemned by Innocent XI., which said "Domestic men-servants and maid-servants may secretly pilfer from their masters, to make compensation to themselves for their work, which they think is more than they need do for the wages which they receive."—L. iv. 522.

Observe, now, the way in which the Jansenistical Pope's condemnation is treated by the Casuists :

'The Salamanca Doctors, and others, speaking of this condemned proposition, say, 1. That a servant can *not* afterwards make himself compensation if he makes his bargain freely with his master for a lower sum, without necessity; but that he is not forbidden to do so, if he agrees on wages considerably less than are just, from necessity; namely, to lighten his own distress. The reason is that Pontifical decrees do not mean to bind a servant contrary to justice.'—L. iv. 522.

Do these writers really believe in the authority which, when it suits them, they are pleased to make so much of, and which it is an almost ruled point of faith to call infallible?¹ It cannot be. See the way in which they argue here. If the Papal decree meant what it clearly does mean, it would be unjust: therefore it *cannot* mean what it clearly does mean: therefore it *does not* mean what it clearly does mean: therefore it means something different from what it clearly does mean. What is it that it does mean? *We* will interpret it by introducing proper limitations and qualifications, and we are the Salamanca Doctors, and Viva, Lessius, Suarez, Molina, &c. with Liguori. Thus they appeal from infallibility to themselves.' La Croix, however, will not go with his brethren:

¹ 'About the infallibility of the Pope there are more opinions than one. The first is that of Luther and Calvin, who heretically teach that the Pope is fallible, though he speaks as universal doctor and even with a council. The second, which Albert Pighius maintains, is the direct contrary to this, that the Pope *cannot err* though speaking in his private capacity. The third is that of some who teach that the Pope is fallible *without a council*. This opinion was embraced by the Gallican clergy in 1682. . . . The fourth, which is the "common opinion," and the one to which we subscribe, is that though the Roman Pontiff, as an individual, or a private doctor, can err (just as he is also fallible in questions of mere fact, which chiefly depend on human testimony); yet when the Pope speaks as the universal doctor, defining *ex cathedra*, that is, from the supreme power given to Peter of teaching the Church, then we say that he is altogether *infallible* in deciding controversies of faith and morals. . . . The Doctors infer that this opinion of ours is at least next to being a matter of faith, and the contrary, as Bellarmine says, seems altogether erroneous, and next to being heresy. . . . Our doctrine that the dogmatic decrees of the Pontiff are infallible. . . . Our opinion of the infallibility of the Pontifical definitions.'—Dissertatio de Rom. Pont. Auctor. Theol. Mor. l. i. 110.

² There are fifteen canons, or rules how to make use of Pontifical decrees, ap-

'Croix says that a servant may not purloin anything at all after he has made a bargain, because then he has given up his right; but it is answered that when a servant is forced by his poverty to make such terms, he does not give up his right voluntarily, but upon compulsion; and so his poverty cannot excuse the master from not paying at least the lowest wages. But when a servant is compelled by necessity to agree for a small sum, he may make himself compensation up to the lowest sum usual. So says Viva, with Lessius, Suarez, Molina, Decian, and others, with (as he says) the "most common opinion." This, however, does not hold if the master has already justly found other servants for the same small sum, or if the servant offered himself, and the master was only employing him through kindness, on account of his indigence.' L. iv. 522.

Croix is thus silenced: but the whole of its force ~~has not~~ yet been extracted from Innocent's decree; ~~so there is a second~~ dictum of the *Salmantinoes* respecting it:

'The Salamanca Doctors say, 2. That if a servant, of his own free choice, does more than his work, he may *not* purloin anything, because he is then supposed to give his labour for the sake of ingratiating himself with his master; *but* he may purloin if he does more than his work by his master's wish, whether expressed or tacit, for then the rule is to be observed that the labourer is worthy of his hire. So the Salamanca Doctors, Molina, Soto, Villalobos, Navarrus, Diana, Fagundez, Bassæus, Corrella, Filguera, Torrecilla, Lastra, and Hozes; and Croix agrees.'—L. iv. 523.

The country gentleman of 20,000*l.* a-year has, as we have seen, suffered serious losses in the character of husband and father. Now he must make up his mind to undergo many more in his character of master. It is true they will not be individually so large in amount, but there will be many more of them, for he doubtless has a large establishment. Nor is the privilege of compensation confined to household servants; it is allowed to every one employed by him on his estates or in his business—*quicumque alius mercenarius*. Here, too, there is not even the check of purloining being venial sin, which in the case

pendent to the *Theologia*. The example given to illustrate the thirteenth is as follows:—Sixtus V. issued a bull named *Detestabilis*, and condemned the method of contract called *trinus contractus*. But Cardinal Toletus and Cardinal S. Severina, who were entrusted by Sixtus V. with the drawing up of the law or bull *Detestabilis*, told Father Stephen Tuccius, a Theologian of the Society of Jesus, that Sixtus did not wish any contracts to be forbidden by his law except what were unjust. Consequently all the contracts which were just before his law was passed, (and many say that the *trinus contractus* was so) were just after it, as the learned Comitulus writes in his *Moral Replies*, lib. iii. qu. 12. n. 3.—*Dissertatio de Rom. Pont. Decretis*, vol. vi. p. 210. There is a mighty war waged in the fourth book of the *Theologia* about this *trine contract*. On one side there are three Popes, Sixtus V., Benedict XIV., and Pius V., supported by twelve Doctors; on the other side twenty-two Doctors, supported by the opinions of the universities and theological faculties of Cologne, Trèves, Alcalá, Salamanca, Ingoldstadt, Freiburg, and Mentz. The twenty-two Doctors and the seven Universities carry the day hollow against the three Popes and the twelve Doctors; and poor Sixtus gets treated with the utmost contumely, each Doctor having a better reason than the last for throwing overboard his *Bulla Detestabilis*.—L. iv. 908.

of the sons, at least, there was. We cannot venture to calculate the amount of loss which he will have to suffer, because we cannot tell the nature of his occupations, and consequently how many men and women he has in his employment. We will take the case of one from which a guess may be made with regard to the others. A footman has been hired for 25*l.* He considers this notably less than what is just, and that he ought to have 35*l.*, which in such a household as his master's is the very lowest sum which a footman of his qualifications ought to receive. However, if he had not taken the place he would have been very likely to have found a difficulty in getting another, and he was too poor to live without one; so he could not help it; he was forced to take what his master offered him, he accepted the terms, and held his tongue. But by having made this bargain with his master for 25*l.* he had not given up his claim to 35*l.* He determines that he will make up the other 10*l.* by secret compensation. But who is to be judge if he really deserves 35*l.* a year? It must be either a Moral Theologian or himself; and to know whether he may decide for himself, he is to ask himself two questions. Is he sure of the justice of the compensation without any risk of hallucination? Is he a prudent man, cautious, and really fit to judge right? He has no difficulty in answering these two questions in the affirmative, and now he is perfectly justified in secretly appropriating 10*l.*, so that he takes care to avoid scandal and annoyance in doing so. The case of John d'Alba is perfectly borne out.

We have also here found a key to an occurrence which took place to ourselves and a companion at Florence in the year 1849. After having stayed for some days at the hotel, we determined on taking lodgings for a fortnight. We accordingly examined some houses which were to be let, and after a time found one which would suit us in all respects. Being then in blissful ignorance of the theory of Compensation—(we had not then begun our studies of S. Alfonso)—we were agreeably surprised to find that the price was lower than that of the other apartments which we had been looking at. We took up our quarters in the lodgings, and were made sufficiently comfortable. At the end of the fortnight we looked over our clothes and other goods, which had not been kept under lock and key, preparatory to our departure. To our dismay we found very serious and considerable losses in the clothes department. We were led to make a vigorous investigation of the house, and from different odd corners, holes, shelves, and drawers, we drew forth several missing waistcoats, shirts, and other articles of dress: especially we recollect raising ourselves by the help of a chair to a lofty shelf, from the far recesses of which we extracted several pairs

of socks which we threw down from our elevation to our companion. Having recovered as much of our property as we were able, we summoned the *Padrone*, demanded the rest of our goods, and told him in pretty plain language, that he was a dishonest man. The *Padrone* was horror-struck; he vowed he had never *stolen* anything in his life, and burst into sobs at the imputation. Seeing that we were not melted, he hastily left the room, and sent in his wife. The lady's nerves were more overcome than her husband's. She burst into floods of tears—so many years she had let lodgings, and never, never before was such a charge brought against her house: she protested by all that was saintly that she had *stolen* nothing. 'Perjury added to theft,' said we grimly to each other in English: nor was the severity of our faces relaxed, except after she had declaimed for half-an-hour or so by an occasional yawn, till she left the room still vowing that nothing had been *stolen*. Now in our simplicity we thought that she and her husband were guilty of petty larceny and of lying to boot. But had we been acquainted with S. Alfonso de' Liguori's Moral Theology, we should have judged them less hardly. From the little facts which came under our notice, we drew the conclusion that they had stolen our goods; whereas we now see that the conclusion which we ought to have drawn was that they had good heads for arguing by analogy—a thing in itself admirable and praiseworthy. They knew from their attendance at the confessional that household servants might compensate themselves in the way explained above if they had wages lower than their services deserved, and they knew that tailors, tradesmen, &c. were justified in purloining little pieces of cloth, using short measures, &c. 'if they would otherwise make no profits, or if they ought to raise their price, and then would not find customers.' (L. iv. 533.) Being gifted with reasoning powers, they inferred that as they had let their apartments at a lower rate than their neighbours, and as they ought to have raised their price, but very likely would not, they thought, have then found lodgers, they were fairly entitled to make up their profits by secret compensation. This they accordingly did; and it was difficult for them perhaps to settle the amount of compensation due to them. It would depend upon the abstract value which they put upon their lodgings totally apart from their bargain with us. We believe that they must have placed a high price upon them in their own minds, for after all the recoveries which we succeeded in making, our Journal-book still relates the loss of many articles of dress which might have continued with us throughout our travels in Italy, had we known the Theory of Secret Compensation, and been accordingly upon our guard.

But further—to return to the country gentleman's household—as there is a large number of servants in the house, the footman's place is not very heavy. This being so, he does more than his regular work, more than he is bound to do by his place, and this he does, not *gratis* or liberally, but intending to be paid for it. Then say Navarrus and Lessius, he may secretly take so much more as he thinks will recompense him for this extra labour. And if his master has appeared to him to exhibit a tacit desire that he should perform these supererogatory tasks, it is the universal opinion of the Doctors that he may proportionately purloin, on the principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire. How much hire his labour is worth he again decides for himself, or his Director settles for him. Perhaps we may fix this at another 5*l*, though we doubt if the footman would be so moderate.

He has still a further right of purloining:—

'Though servants sin gravely in carrying eatables and drinkables out of the house and selling them, they are more easily excused (in the same way that monks are) for what they consume themselves at home; for then the master or the prelate is often only unwilling with regard to the secret manner of taking, not with regard to the appropriation itself. Yet it might be feared that he would be unwilling if things extraordinary were taken.—Layman, Escobar, and Lessius. The latter teaches that very little thefts of servants out of eatables which are not generally locked up, do not unite so as to become grave matter, if what is stolen is not taken to sell, but only to eat. So too, Cajetan, Navarrus, Bannez, Moya, and Sanchez in Croix. But Sporer rightly does not admit this last point, if the quantity is large.'—L. iv. 545.

So, if they are not kept locked up, the footman may drink his master's champagne and claret—or, supposing him very conscientious, he may perhaps confine himself to the port and sherry; and all the eatables, from the store-room to the larder, are at the mercy of the respective servants who have to do with them. This again will be a serious expense to the master of the house, particularly, as in spite of Sporer, however much is thus consumed in the end, the small quantities stolen at several times cannot coalesce into one notable quantity, and so there can be no grave sin.¹

¹ 'We have said in the First Book, and we shall say more at length in the Sixth Book, that if a Penitent has a probable opinion on his side he cannot be refused absolution; and this is "commonly" taught.' So if the confessor recommends Sporer's doctrine, the penitent has only to quote Lessius or Cajetan, and then he may demand absolution. 'After having confessed his sins the penitent has a definite right to absolution, and it may not be denied him, unless he is otherwise indisposed, and he cannot be called indisposed for not following the confessor's opinion, for it does not belong to the latter to reject opinions which other wise men approve of.'—L. iv. 669.

Alas for the dignity, the uprightness, the purity, the confidence of homes, when such principles as these come into vogue! We have been calculating the money losses of the master of the house; but we trust that our readers have seen that it has been in a sort of *εἰσὸν ἑλκεῖν* that we have confined ourselves to this point. What are money losses as compared to all the other far more precious losses which he would have to suffer? Where could be the husband's reposing trust in the assured affection of the wife of his bosom? Where could be the respectful and tender confidence between father and son? Where the guileless frankness between brother and sister? Where the unhesitating trust in the old servant's, or retainer's, honesty and faithfulness? They could not but wither and utterly perish. Englishmen do not sufficiently realise the blessings of an English home. Whether it be the Elizabethan mansion surrounded by its ancestral trees, or the humbler parsonage, or the old farm-house, or the cottage—*home and home relations* are essentially English. Nowhere else is found that union of liberty and restraint among the younger members, of combined respect and love towards the head of the house, of confidence and frankness among all. The English Church is essentially domestic. She strengthens the ties of home, sanctifies them, and works through them. Rome cuts away home influences in her love of centralization, and substitutes that of the Director. The husband, father, and master is no longer the head of the house, around which the thoughts and feelings of the family are grouped. An extraneous mind is the ruling power. He who ought to be the rightful authority feels that he is so no longer; there is a shadow between him and his; confidence is not given, and therefore he does not give it. He feels himself no longer the centre of the household. He knows not why, or, if he does know, his religious principles forbid him to apply a remedy,—he acquiesces and betakes himself to the Café. Such books as Michelet's 'Priests, Women, and Families'—embittered, maddened, frenzied, as they are—would not have been written without some cause.

Look at what a home ought to be, its confidence, its love, its reverence, and its dignity; and then look at the picture as drawn by Liguori, of a household free from all but venial sin,¹—the wife pilfering from her husband, appropriating a large percentage of his income, and taking care that he should not find it out, keeping her relations out of his goods, in spite of his prohibition, secretly subtracting one thing and another

¹ We must again remind our readers that venial sins do not diminish God's love towards the agent, (Hom. Apost. iii. 66,) not though he determines to commit every venial sin that has been, is, or will be. (Theol. Mor. l. v. 12.)

thing, and being justified in all by her Director: children stealing periodically, cursing and mocking at their parents behind their backs; refusing to acknowledge or to recognise them, if they are ashamed of them; taught to conceal their purpose of entering into Holy Orders, or the Monastic life, from them as from enemies, but, with a curious inconsistency, required, though not absolutely bound, if they marry, to marry whom their parents bid them: daughters, as we find from the same authority, not allowed to be taught to read by a man, and scarcely by quite a little brother; not trusted to go to church by themselves, or to stay long in church without their parents' supervision; not allowed to receive more than one, or at most two visits from their betrothed, and that for the most degrading of all reasons; and lastly, servants pilfering to recompense themselves for having too low wages; pilfering to recompense themselves for extra work which they do; pilfering all the eatables and drinkables which are not kept locked up. Who would not take refuge in Cafés and places of public resort, in which gentlemen in foreign countries spend so much of their time, out of such a place as this, to which the name of *home* can be scarcely applied except in mockery? We will transcribe a few lines of Mr. Martin Tupper's 'Proverbial Philosophy' by way of contrast:—

' My soul was sickened within me, so I sought the dwelling place of Joy;
And I met it not in laughter; I found it not in wealth or power;
But I saw it in the pleasant home where religion smiled upon content,
And the satisfied ambition of the heart rejoiced in the favour of its God.

* * * *

His love is pure and single, sincere, and knoweth not change;
For his manhood has been blessed with the pleasant choice of his youth:
Behold his one beloved; she leaneth on his arm,
And he looketh on the years that are past to review the dawn of her affection.

Behold his little ones around him; they bask in the warmth of his smile;
And infant innocence and joy lighten their happy faces;
He is holy, and they honour him; he is loving, and they love him:
He is consistent, and they esteem him; he is firm, and they fear him.
His friends are the excellent among men; and the bands of their friendship are strong;

His house is the palace of peace: for the Prince of Peace is there.
As the wearied man to his couch, as the thoughtful man to his musings,
Even so from the bustle of life he goeth to his well-ordered home.

* * * *

Man, the noble and intelligent, gladdeneth earth in beauty,
And woman's beauty sunneth him, as with a smile from heaven.¹

It may be thought that in picturing a Liguorian *home*, free from all but venial sin in thieving and other respects, we have

¹ Proverbial Philosophy. On Joy and on Beauty.

made a somewhat unfair selection: our readers may think that the Church of Rome is notoriously unfavourable to the domestic relations, but that, at any rate, there would not be this permission to purloin, and this general laxity, in a state which she specially approves, and stamps with the title of the Religious life. We will make a few extracts on this point from the *Homo Apostolicus* :—

‘It is doubted what quantity is grave for a monk to spend without leave? Some say that the same decision should be come to about the thefts of monks relatively to their monastery, as about the thefts of sons relatively to their parents. But Sanchez and Lugo are right in not admitting this, because sons are capable of possessing, and monks are not, and also Prelates are more unwilling in the case of their monks thieving than parents in that of their sons. The Doctors, however, say in common that a greater quantity is required for a monk’s theft out of the monastery’s goods to be grave, than in the case of other thefts. Opinions differ as to what it should be. Azorius, Navarrus, Castropalao, Sanchez, &c. fix on 1*l.* for grave matter, and rather more when the convent is rich; but this seems too indulgent. Soto and Rodriguez fix on 10*s.* as grave matter, and Croix counts this certain. Lugo thinks that 2*s.* 6*d.* is grave matter, and 3*s.* 4*d.* if the monastery is rich, even though the monk takes it from the portion assigned to his own use; but supposing he gave it to other monks belonging to the monastery, he extends the sum to 1*l.* 5*s.*, provided that it is not in actual money. Sanchez, Bonacina, the Salamanca Doctors, &c. allow that it is no grave fault to take eatables at many different times and in light matter, though afterwards they reach to grave matter, as Prelates are presumed not to be gravely unwilling, provided (as they limit it) that the damage done to the convent is not great, and the things are not precious.’—*Hom. Apost.* xiii. 10.

The principle is the same in the *Theologia Moralis*, but there is a difference in some particulars. The sums there fixed for grave matter are (1) 1*s.* 8*d.*; (2) more than 1*s.* 8*d.* provided that the convent be rich; (3) still more than that if it is not money, but clothes, books, &c.; (4) 2*s.* 11*d.* if taken from what is destined for himself; (5) or 3*s.* 4*d.*; (6) more than that if purloined for his own use; (7) 2*s.* 6*d.* if purloined from the common goods of the monastery, and given to strangers; (8) 3*s.* 4*d.* if taken *ex rebus quæ usu non consumuntur*, provided it is only done once or twice a-year; (9) or 3*s.* 9*d.*; (10) 10*s.*; (11) the same sum which sons are allowed to steal, ‘for monks stealing what ‘would in ordinary cases be grave matter, commit no sin against ‘justice, but only against their vow of poverty, unless the theft ‘causes grave damage to the monastery;’ (12) 5*s.* if taken from what is allowed for his use, and given to a brother-monk; (13) or even 8*s.* 4*d.*; (14) more than 1*l.* 5*s.* if not actually money; (15) still more than that if coming from extraneous persons to give to others. Theft of small amount do not coalesce so as to become grave if there is a long interval between them: and a ‘long interval’ is interpreted by Sanchez to mean a year, by the

Salamanca Doctors, Filliuccius, Diana, Garcias, and Antony of the Holy Ghost, to mean a month.¹

And as we are anxious that we should not make things appear worse than they really are, we desire therefore especially to call the attention of our readers to the fact that in this passage the word theft implies something a little different from that which we generally understand by it. The notion which we generally have of theft is secret appropriation for personal gratification. Here it does not always mean that the thing appropriated is consumed in personal gratification: it may be given away to others, or spent upon self: and it may be taken from the common goods of the monastery, or from the goods assigned to the monk's own use. In the last case the chief feature of the act is that of disobedience, because it is a thing forbidden by the laws of the community, to the control of which the individual has submitted himself; it does, however, likewise involve secret appropriation, because he has no right to more than that which is sufficient for his personal support, according to the rules of the Society: and if that which he purloins is anything of the nature of clothes or of a fixture with which the monastery had supplied him, it will become necessary for the monastery to replace it. Still we should not brand it with the title of theft in the harshest sense of that word. But whenever the sum taken is purloined from the general goods of the monastery, the pilferer is then directly guilty of theft:—theft more excusable, if what is taken is given away to others; theft less excusable if retained for himself. The tariff by which monks are to steal, varies according to these differences. The sums fixed are the following:

	£	s.	d.
According to some Doctors .	0	1	8 ²
According to other Doctors .	0	2	6
According to other Doctors .	0	2	11
According to other Doctors .	0	3	4
According to other Doctors .	0	3	9
According to other Doctors .	0	5	0
According to other Doctors .	0	8	4
According to other Doctors .	0	10	0
According to other Doctors .	1	0	0
According to other Doctors .	1	5	0

¹ Theol. Mor. v. 24, 25.

² We have considerable doubts whether there is not a misprint of *argentei* for *aurei* in the *Theologia Moralis*, and that instead of 1s. 8d. it ought to be 1l.; for the same authors (Navarrus, Azorius, &c.) are quoted in the *Homo Apostolicus* for the latter sum who are set down in the former as authorizing only the less liberal amount. It is a thing which should be looked to; for it would be a serious hardship on a monk to confine him, owing to a misprint, to stealing 1s. 7½d a-month, when he might have stolen 19s. 11½d.

The vow of poverty, which was referred to above in the passage taken from the *Theologia Moralis*, and which, if honestly observed, would make it impossible for monks to give away anything not supplied to them for the purpose, except by first stealing it, is one of the three vows essential to the monastic life; the others being those of chastity and obedience. 'By the vow of poverty,' says the *Theologia Moralis*, 'the monk is bound to have nothing of his own; that is, no temporal goods which can be valued at a price; the ownership of these things, or, at least, the free and independent disposition of them, he has given up for ever.' 'By the vow of poverty,' says the *Homo Apostolicus*, 'monks are forbidden to possess or to dispose of anything whatsoever which can be valued by money.' This appears strict and self-denying. Now mark the exceptions:—

'It is not contrary to the vow of poverty, 1, to possess goods in common, as S. Thomas teaches, and as it is expressly allowed by the Council of Trent. It is not contrary to the vow of poverty, 2, to possess private property, or a maintenance, which monks in many Orders keep with the Prelate's licence; because, though according to the Council of Trent it does not seem possible to doubt that this is forbidden, since it is there said, "Let none be allowed to possess goods, moveables, or fixtures, even in the name of the convent:" nevertheless the custom which has now become almost universal, and is tolerated by the Holy See, does make it allowable to have private property, for necessary and honest uses, with the permission of the Superiors, provided that the monk is ready to give it up at the Prelate's nod: for the vow of poverty, though it cannot be abrogated in substance, yet (as the Doctors agree) can be changed as to its manner, according to custom, which is presumed to be right when practised by scrupulous monks, and tolerated by Superiors, who know what goes on, and do not forbid it, when they easily might.'—*Hom. Apost. xiii. 6.*

Thus we learn that custom is superior in authority to Church law and to the Decrees of Councils, and that a monk is still considered to keep his oath of possessing nothing, though he possesses things (1) in common with others, (2) in private by himself. We learn from the same chapter that Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. issued Bulls forbidding monks to make any gifts: but 'many doctors quoted by those of Salamanca, say that Clement's Bull has not been received, or at least has become obsolete, and therefore does not bind; and others have said the same of Urban's.' Liguori, however, thinks that this cannot be maintained, and goes off to the question of grave and light matter,—for, of course, if they give a small quantity, they make no grave transgression of the Bulls: how much that quantity may be, depends, he says, on 'the approved custom, according as the aforesaid Bulls have been received in any of the Orders.'¹ Again, we learn that 'Monks commit no sin in not observing their primitive rule after a contrary use

¹ Hom. Apost. xiii. 24.

'has been introduced.'" Elsewhere we find, on the same authority, that monks may go out hunting two or three times a-year, provided they can do so without giving scandal or making a great deal of noise ;¹ and it is laid down as a rule, supposing that each monk has 25*l.* a-year, he may stake 1*l.* 5*s.* every year on games of cards, &c.² There may be some room left for observance of the vow of poverty and strict self-denial, and we doubt not that a man who was in earnest would find it, like, for example, S. John of the Cross ;³ but we cannot be surprised to learn, still on S. Alfonso's authority, that one motive which frequently induces men to enter monasteries, and against which Confessors are desired to be on their guard, is 'the desire of spending a more comfortable life'—*vitam agendi commodiorem*.⁴ Nor can one be greatly astonished at finding that it is his deliberate opinion that 'the majority of nuns (*major harum pars*)' enter their nunneries not by the calling of God, but by the 'urgency of their parents, and hence it is that they afterwards lead there a life of restlessness, and introduce laxities into the

¹ Hom. Apost. xiii. 17.

² Ibid. x. 72.

³ 'How great a sum may a monk stake on a game? Sporer thinks that if the game is not specially forbidden by his Rule, he may stake three florins a-year. But others, as Lugo, Elbel, Sanchez, Navarrus, Gregory of Valentia, Jacobus de Graffia, Saloniuss, Molina, &c. think, "with probability," that if a monk has 25*l.* a-year, he may stake 1*l.* 5*s.*, provided that he has not spent as much during the same year on other unnecessary uses. Others, again, as the Salamanca Doctors, Lugo, Molina, Azorius, &c. say that he may stake as much as he can save by spare living out of the things assigned to his use.'—Theol. Mor. l. iv. 901. This is not a very high motive for a monk's living sparsely.

⁴ S. Juan de la Cruz was, under S. Teresa's auspices, the great reformer of the Carmelite Order. The Breviary's account of him is short: *Severioris disciplinae et arctioris vite cupidissimus, primitivam Ordinis Regulam ex Superioris licentia professus est*. It tells us, too, that *strictioris disciplinae promovendæ ardore accensus*, he was divinely given to S. Teresa, as her assistant in restoring the observance of the original Rules; and that finally, after great toils, and worn out by sickness, he fell asleep in the 49th year of his age. His Spanish biographer enters into further details, and shows us what the 'Superior's licence' means, and what was the cause of his toils and sickness. The convent into which he entered was one where the rules were, as usual, not observed, and the young monk resolved upon keeping them. At first he was scorned for his Puritanism; then he was persecuted. He was shut up in the *carcel*, or prison of the monastery; a small dark room, admitting light only by an opening in the door: from hence he was brought out, and scourged before all the brethren, at first every day, afterwards every Friday. At last he determined to escape; he broke out of his prison, and let himself down from the convent wall by a rope, assisted, as his Biographer says, by *la Virgen Santissima*. For a time he was in danger of being retaken, but after a while he settled himself at a distance, and lived alone and unmolested. Others came and joined him, and S. Teresa suggested to him to found a new monastery on the old rule. She furnished him with money obtained from the nunneries under her control, procured him licences from Rome, and under her direction he carried out the desired reform. But it was to the sufferings which he had to undergo in his original monastery, that his Biographer (in his Life prefixed to the folio edition of his Works, and published by authority) attributes the ruin of his health, to which the Breviary refers.

⁵ Prax. Conf. cap. vii. 92.

'community to the common detriment.'¹ And supposing this laxity to have crept in, we do not see how it is easily to be weeded out again, for it seems that liberty of lying—we beg pardon, of covering the truth by means of words—is granted to nuns, even when subject to their Bishop's visitation:—

'It is to be noted that nuns being interrogated by the Bishop or the Prelate of the Order in the act of Visitation, are bound to discover the truth about the observance of the rule, as De Alessandro and Texeda say, even though the transgressions be light, because the relaxation of the whole rule generally begins from them.'

Bravely spoken! But now for the exceptions. Could there be one nun who would not be excused?

'Lezana and Alessandro, however, excuse nuns from telling the truth, 1. If the crime is amended: hence they infer that no one is bound to lay open another's crime committed some years since, say three years, as Mascardus thinks: and for the same reason reproof is generally to be used before denunciation. 2. Nuns are excused from telling the truth if the crime is concealed, and there is no scandal or clear proof. 3. If they are sure that the Prelate will apply no remedy; or if they know that other nuns, from whom they heard of the crime themselves, have denounced it, for no one is bound to do a useless work. 4. If telling it has a tendency to do harm to themselves. 5. If the crime is known under the obligation of a natural secret, except, however, it is productive of common damage.'—*Theol. Mor.* l. v. 57.

We have lingered so long over Liguori's Theory of Theft and of Domestic and Monastic Economy, that we have no space left for the Theory of Restitution of what is stolen. We will extract one passage from the *Praxis Confessarii*:—

'If the theft is uncertain,—i.e. if it is not known who the person is to whom the damage is done—the penitent is to be bound to make restitution for the purpose of having Masses celebrated, or giving alms to the poor, or making gifts to holy places, and, if he is poor himself, he may apply it to himself, or to his family.'—Cap. ii. 44.

For example, Pius V. decreed that, if incumbents did not say divine office, they should make restitution of a certain part of the fruits or income of the benefice: but he did not say to whom the restitution was to be made. The Casuists supply the omission:—

'It is to be given to the poor, or the Church, or to be spent on the parsonage house, or in improving the parsonage lands. And under the name of the poor come all poor people, wherever they live, and the dead, too, are meant by it. And the incumbent himself, also, may apply the said fruits to his own relief, if he is really poor, as Palao, Navarrus, Suarez, Bonacina, Toletus, Viva and Lessius say in accordance with the "common opinion." Except, however, he purposely omits office, knowing that he may keep the fruits because he is a poor man, as Palao and Viva rightly notice.'—L. iv. 672.

¹ Hom. Apost. vii. 61.

And again:—

'You are excused from making restitution of things the owner of which is uncertain, if you have made composition with the Bishop or the Pope; and also in case you are bound to restore something to the poor, and being yourself really in want, you give it to yourself—*tibi ipsi eam des*; and in this latter case, though you afterwards become richer, still you are not bound to make restitution.'—L. iv. 696.

Deridet, says Cicero, speaking of one of Verres' iniquitous tricks, *quum sibi ipsum jubet satisfacere Rabonium*. What would he have said to a man stealing first and then conscientiously making restitution—to himself? But Cicero was a heathen, and had not the approbation of infallibility.

We have now shown at length the authorized teaching of Rome on two most important branches of Morals—on Truthfulness and Falsehood, and on Honesty and Stealing. We appeal to the unprejudiced conscience, if on these points she is indeed the high-principled, strict, unbending, religious moralist, which her advocates have represented her to be, when they have been dealing with earnest and enthusiastic minds, and it has therefore suited their purpose so to represent her. The theory of the English Church and of the Primitive Church, on the subject of Equivocation, we have shown to be the direct contradictory of that which she holds, inasmuch as England and Antiquity alike inculcate Truthfulness, and Rome justifies Deceit. With regard to theft we have no *theory*—we have a *precept*, 'Thou shalt not steal;' and the expansion of that precept by our Theologians has been for the purpose of showing how we may keep it in the spirit and in the letter, not how we may break it in the spirit while we may keep it in the letter. Anglican moralists do not frame definitions excluding what ought to be included, and then argue from their definitions. They do not employ their ingenuity in teaching how to lie without lying, how to steal without stealing, how to sin without sinning. On the subject of thieving, the Church herself explains in her Catechism what she understands by the Divine command, 'Thou shalt not steal.' The lessons which she draws from it are two, one positive and the other negative; and these she puts into the mouth of each one of her children. They are, 1. To be true and just in all my dealings. 2. To keep my hands from picking and stealing. And these two lessons are still further enforced by her Divines. Take Bishop Nicholson, for example. He writes:—

'Man may have a just title to somewhat which he may call his own, whether his title ariseth by just acquisition, inheritance, by gift or donation, or by contract. And it is the purpose of God here to secure *suum cuique*, every man in his own estate, setting a hedge and a fence about his goods

by an eternal law of commutative justice, that no man dare to break over, or rush upon, what is his, without an apparent injury and an affront done to God. This being the end, (1.) *Here is commanded*, 1. That every man be content with his estate, and to have moderate desires. 2. To preserve our neighbour's goods, and to suffer every man to enjoy his own quietly and fairly. 3. To give and pay every man his due, and injure no man. 4. To use justice in all our dealings, contracts, bargains. 5. To be frugal, and not to spend above our estates. 6. To use honest means to get a livelihood, viz. prayer and labour. 7. To use our goods to benefit others justly, liberally, cheerfully. 8. That we restore what is unjustly gotten or detained. (2.) *Here is forbidden*, 1. Injustice, violence, oppression. 2. Covetousness, and hoarding up all that comes in. 3. Tenacity or the niggard's hand. 4. Contentiousness, and vexatious lawsuits. 5. Immoderate care and solicitude. 6. Deceit, fraud, circumvention in bargaining, contracts, buying, selling. 7. Picking and stealing, or secret purloinings. 8. Open robbery, violence, plundering, and rapacity. 9. False weights and measures. 10. Sacrilege: to detain tithes, tribute, custom. 11. To borrow and not to pay again when they are able. 12. To detain hirelings' wages, cheat orphans and widows. 13. To embezzle other men's estates and fail a trust. 14. To receive bribes and to set justice to sale. 15. To break their promise, and refuse to stand to their bargains. 16. To embase and adulterate coin, and pass it for good and perfect. 17. Prodigality, to waste their own estate. 18. They who make not restitution offend. 19. To live an idle life, and not to use honest labour to live.—*Bishop Nicholson on the Catechism*, p. 114.

We can conceive the lofty contempt with which a disciple of S. Alfonso would look down upon the simplicity which could have dictated this teaching. 'What? not one word about purloining not being thieving? Nothing about extreme and quasi-extreme necessity? Nothing about distressed noblemen providing for themselves out of other people's goods? Nothing about robbing Turks? No reference to grave and light matter? Nothing about mortal and venial thieving? No tariff laid down to steal by? No thieving-licence given to wives and children? No permission of pilfering to servants and monks? No theory of secret compensation? Secret purloining and the use of short weights and measures absolutely forbidden? Bribes not to be received by judges? Promises not to be broken? Such is the result of Anglican negotiations! Thanks to Heaven that we are living where Morals have been studied and systematized under the humane and indulgent supervision of the Holy Roman Church!'

ART. V.—*Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History, applied to Language and Religion.* By CHEVALIER BUNSEN. London: Longmans. 1854.

IN a recent article on Mr. Dennis's 'Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria,' we engaged to revert to a special branch of Etruscan archæology—the national language, the only key to the origin of the race—whenever Chevalier Bunsen's long-promised volumes should issue from the press. We cannot feel otherwise than disappointed that these learned and laborious researches have thrown no fuller and clearer light upon this mysterious enigma; a result, however, which ought to be attributed far more to the poverty of the materials to which the ethnological theory is applied,—the paucity of monumental inscriptions, and the non-existence of any national literature,—than to defects inherent in the Chevalier's method of investigation. Before, however, we present to the reader the results of M. Bunsen's labours, it may be well to pass briefly in review the leading speculations which have been broached upon this perplexing question, since the study of Etruscan lore first arrested the attention of the antiquarian world. This we owe in mere courtesy to our readers, since the value of the Chevalier's contributions can only be estimated by comparison with those of others, with whose researches, in so abstruse a province of classical learning, the generality of our readers can hardly be expected to be very familiar.

One of the earliest theories, which found especial favour among the ultramontane learned, assumed the Etruscans to be originally a Transalpine race, who, descending as conquerors into the plains of the Po, had gradually pushed their settlements in a southerly direction. The idea was not destitute of ancient authority and classical countenance; it was supported by the recorded fact, that there really were, at a later period, in the Rhætian Alps, tribes speaking the Etruscan dialect. The term Rasena was brought into connexion with 'Rhætian,' and the Celtic and Teutonic dialects were held, for the moment, safer guides than the Egyptian or the Hebrew. The theory, however, though afterwards renewed with more success by Niebuhr and his school, did not at the time attract numerous adherents; it was succeeded, in the then prevailing rage for Oriental etymology, by the Phœnico-Egyptian delusion, which, at first, won popular opinion, though its futilities ere long caused it to be hissed off the historical arena, with much justice, as its own

authors candidly confessed. The classical theory of interpretation now became the favourite. Antecedent probability, in the absence of any positive evidence, countenanced the connexion of a primitive people of Italy with the Latins and Greeks, rather than with Arabs and Egyptians. The mischievous plausibilities of Lanzi, the pillar of this system, long proved a serious impediment to the progress of sound inquiry. He neglected the distinction between the Etruscan inscriptions proper, and those of the various conterminous tribes, Umbrians, Oscans, &c., which doubtless contain an admixture of Greek and Latin elements never hitherto discoverable in the Etruscan tongue. Various etymological expedients (*lucus a non lucendo*) were invoked in aid of this fallacious system; transposition, substitution, intercalation of grammatical forms, were all enlisted, and exhausted in the process. *Hupitaiseke* becomes, in his arbitrary vocabulary, *ὑποτέθεικε*, *monumentum posuit*: *Turke* is discovered to be *δώρευκε* (*δεδώρευκε*): *Tular* is merely the Etruscan form of *τὸ ἁλλάριον*: not to fatigue the reader with other illustrations, deservedly ridiculed by a clever contemporary some ten years ago, who remarked that 'here lieth' would give equally good Greek for *ἱερὸς λίθος*: 'this stone' for *δύστονος*, &c.

The proverbial prejudices of the Italian literati soon afterwards found an eloquent advocate in Micali, who rallied all the learning of his time in support of the opinion of Dionysius, that the Etruscans were an indigenous Italian race. This doctrine was shortly afterwards attacked by Niebuhr, who recurred to the Rhætian theory of Frèret, believing the Etruscans to have been a tribe from the Rhætian Alps, who conquered the Tyrrhene Pelasgi, the earlier possessors of the land. He defended his own version of their origin by the resemblance—a resemblance, we need hardly say, palpable only to the second-sight of etymologists—of the name 'Rasena,' which the Etruscans used to designate themselves, to 'Rhæti;' by the statements of the ancients, that the Rhætians were of Etruscan extraction; by the analogy which certain dialects now spoken in those regions bear to the Etruscan; and also by the fact that no earlier population than the Etruscan is recorded to have inhabited those mountains. The fact, however, that ancient monuments resembling the Etruscan, and inscriptions in a character very similar, have been found among the Rætian and Novic Alps, though it may in a great degree authenticate the connexion of Etruria with those regions, can only support the theory of the original extraction of the people thence, at the expense of the Roman authorities of Livy, Justin, and Pliny, who concurrently declare the Etruscan emigration to have been from the south in a northerly direction. A modification of Niebuhr's view was

held by Ottfried Müller,—that the later element in the Etruscan nation was derived from Lydia, yet composed not of natives, but of Tyrrhene Pelasgi, who had settled on the coasts of Asia Minor; and that the earlier lords of the land were the Rasena, from the mountains of Rhætia, who, driving back the Umbrians, and uniting with the Tyrrheni on the Tarquinian coast, constituted the Etruscan race.

The next champion who appeared on the lists of the archaeological arena was Sir W. Betham, the late Ulster King-at-arms, whose Quixotic caprices may possibly be more amusing to the reader than the dry and barren details we have hitherto been forced to record. He broached the extraordinary theory, that the Etruscans, the Phœnicians, and the old Milesians of Erin were the same people, speaking identically the same Erse; that Etruria was colonized from the east, then Ireland from Etruria. He endeavoured, by the most ludicrous devices, to substantiate this system by an analysis of the Eugubian tables, and the great Etruscan inscription of Perugia. By appeals to archaic glossaries and obsolete dialects, by capricious divisions of words and syllables, and other expedients of a despairing invention, he elicited from an examination of the first of these documents the valuable discovery that it contained, in old Erse, an account of the colonization of Ireland, with a log-book of the voyage which led to the event. The commencement of the second Eugubian table may serve as a specimen of his method: No. I. is the text according to its own subdivision of words; No. II. is Sir William's Hiberno-Punic edition; Nos. III. and IV. are his two English versions:—

- 'I. BUKUKUM: IUBIU: PUNE: UBEF: FURFATH: TREF:
BITLUF: TURUF: MARTE: THURIE: FETU:
PUPLUPER: TUTAS: IUBINAS &c.
- 'II. Bu co com iud be i u Pune u be fa for fath tre fa
bi at lu fa tur u fa mar ta tur i e fad
u pob lu bar to ta is i iud be i na is &c.
- 'III. Was which security day and night in from Phœnician from night
means defence by skill throughout the means being also water
means voyage from the means as indeed the voyage in it far away
people water of the sea is gentle indeed it is by wisdom day and
night in it is &c.
- 'IV. There was security, day and night, during the whole voyage to and
from the river, Phœnician, from the night precautions and skill, and
there being deep water in the river. By this skill in distant voyages
of the people of the water to the north, is the sea indeed practicable;
secure by day and night, gentle, indeed, in the sea, it is, &c.'

A clever contributor to the *Quarterly Review* undertook to extract out of these inscriptions, through the medium of any real language of Europe, living or dead, better sense than Sir

William elicited from his imaginary Hiberno-Phœnician,—nay, real sense, for in the jargon quoted above there is obviously no sense at all. In submitting the following sample of what might be done for the Teutonic family, he assumed only, with more modesty than Sir William, that the Eugubian tables are written in a primitive, but still intelligible, Anglo-Saxon dialect; and that the second table contains, not a log-book of voyages to Erin, but a commercial treaty between the Etruscans and the Phœnicians; ‘one written in current grammatical sense, without Ulsterian transpositions, and with vastly less than Ulsterian corruption of the original Umbrian text:—

‘Bi ok u kum iu bi o Pune o bef for fat drov bi tal of Tur of Mart Ethruria fed o pupl u pa her tute as iu bi in as &c.

‘By oak you come, you buy, O Phœnician, o’ beef, four fat drove, by tale of Tyre, of the Mart of Etruria; feed, O people! you pay her duty, as you buy, in asses, &c.’

‘In “oak,” for oaken ship, the correspondence with the Latin terms, abies, trabs, and the modern Italian legno, is remarkable; both probably traceable to the same Etruscan usage. The “tale” (perhaps toll?) of Tyre, specifies doubtless the number of oxen in each drove contracted for, according to some conventional Phœnician standard. The apostrophe, “feed O people,” is a fine sample of the combination of the poetical with the practical, common in such documents among a primitive race. The as, we need scarcely add, was the current Etruscan coin. The commencement of the first table reads equally well. It specifies the different prices or duties of corn:—

“Punic corn is paid, o’ rye, at a higher, yea a bye code; no reclaim (drawback?) &c.”

We shall close our list with Mrs. Hamilton Gray, who, unhappily for her literary fame, imbibed all the prejudices of the old Egyptian school. She assumed Etruscan emigration from a certain Mesopotamian city, whose Scriptural name was Resen, and whose Egyptian title she conveniently supposes to have been Ludim. Hence, of course, their designations, Rasena and Lydian. From Resen she transports them to Egypt, whence they are expelled by the native powers, and accordingly cross to the Italian coast. ‘Had she but made them,’ says the reviewer alluded to above, ‘on traversing the Mediterranean, land first in Gaul, and cross the Rhætian Alps into Lombardy, she would have had the merit of blending the Phœnician, Egyptian, Lydian, Libyan, and Celtic systems into one.’ Having, in a recent article upon Mr. Dennis’s work, adverted in some detail to that exploded superstition, the Egypto-Oriental mania, we are sure our readers will readily dispense with any refutation of Mrs. H. Gray’s theory here; the more, as its features present scarcely any variation from those in which it has long been familiar to the public in the pages of the *Universal History*.

We have no intention of plunging our readers into M. Bunsen's voluminous researches, further than is necessary to reflect the few additional rays of light which they cast upon the problem before us. Before, however, the Chevalier records the latest results of comparative philology, in reference to the Etruscan enigma, there are several interesting pages, in which he traces the gradual development of the philosophy of language from the earliest era of critical inquiry; the contents of which, especially as they bear closely upon the subject at issue, will probably be acceptable to many of our readers.

In laying them before the public, we must revert to the old style of reviewing—that of citation at length—in the assurance that it would be impossible to condense them with effect. An outline of the history of philological science from the era of Pythagoras and Plato to that of Leibnitz, the author of the 'Comparative Philosophy of Language,' and the first successful classifier of the languages then known, is given in the following terms:—

'The profound passage in Genesis (ii. 19), "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam, to see *what he would call them*; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof," finds its philosophical echo in Pythagoras. Jamblichus and Proclus report the following as one of his sayings: Having been asked What was the wisest among things? he answered, "Number;" and, What next in wisdom? "The Name-giver." This is explained by the account preserved in Clemens of Alexandria (*Ecl. Proph.* i. 32), that Pythagoras thought of all wise men he was not only the most rational, but also the most ancient, who gave the names to things. Pythagoras, as well as the Bible, supposes man to have formed language, and both consider this act as primitive, and analogous to that of the Divine mind, by which there is order and measure in the universe. With Heraclitus, "the dark," and Democritus, his contemporary, begins the antagonism which pervades the whole Greek and Latin philosophy of language. Heraclitus considered the words of language as the shadow of bodies, or the image reflected in the mirror—types of objective reality; whereas the other school saw in them products of convention. According to one, language existed by nature (objectively); according to the other, by a positive arbitrary act of man (subjectively). The first were, according to another term, analogists; the others, anomalists. Plato, in his "Cratylus," and Aristotle in his "Organon," may be said, however, to be the men who, upon the traces of their predecessors, have laid the foundations of the philosophy of language. Plato, following Pythagoras and Socrates, is an analogist; Aristotle tends to anomalism; but as Plato acknowledges the positive or conventional element, so Aristotle does not deny the objectivity which lies at the bottom of language. He is startled by the fact that the languages of men are so many and so different, and, therefore, places the conventional element first; but, as he expressly says (*De Animâ*, c. i.) that the sounds of the voice are symbolical of the affections of the soul, we must not interpret this only of the interjectional sounds, but also of the words expressing things and thought, or real language. The speculations of Plato, when rightly understood, bear upon the highest problems of the philosophy of language; the categories and defini-

tions of Aristotle lay the logical foundations of our grammatical system, and establish by themselves the great principle, that language is the immediate product and expression—as it were—the mirror of logic and thought. In the speculations of both we see the entire want of an abstract knowledge of the etymological rules of their own language, and still more of a system, or even a tendency, to compare the Greek tongue with those of the barbarians. Nor did the later philosophers and philologists of Greece and Rome pursue such a course. Epicurus acknowledges expressly the two elements, and places that which comes from nature through the affections of the soul first; the positive element second. The Stoics originated the grammar, and, in particular, proposed the first theory of the Greek verb and its conjugation. Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and Crates, and, at a later period, Apollonius Dyscolus, were the acute and learned members of the Alexandrian Academy who erected that fabric of grammatical definitions and terms which, brought nearer to us by Varro and the later Latin grammarians, has formed the basis of our grammatical system, and, through the Syrian Christians, of that of the Arabs. The Indian grammar, however, is original and ancient.

‘As to the lexicographical¹ inquiries and speculations of the ancients, their blunders in both are proverbial, and constitute an important fact in the history of the human mind. Their absurd etymologies² are the most striking proof of the impossibility of man becoming conscious of his peculiarities, except by contrast and comparison with those of others. If the Roman world did little for the philosophy of language, though even Cæsar speculated and wrote upon it, the Byzantine age, in this branch also, did nothing but preserve the corpse of ancient science, reduced to formularies and epitomes, such as ages sinking into materialism, or any other form of barbarism, generally prefer to scientific and learned investigations.

‘The Germanic middle ages had not the means, and did not feel the vocation, for inquiring into realities; although Christianity had given them the idea of humanity as distinct from nationality; and although the study of Latin, and afterwards of Greek, and the acquaintance with the Saracens, led them naturally to a greater knowledge of the properties and diversities of language. The genial and free philosophy of the fifteenth century,

¹ This censure is far too indiscriminate. In some respects the Greek lexicographers surpassed our own in the extent and variety of their researches. We have no vocabularies specially devoted to the phraseology of our great writers,—of Chaucer, of Milton, of Shakspeare; whereas Grecian literature possessed, from the times of Gorgias (440 B.C.) various collections of Homeric, Platonic, and other elegant phraseology. Shortly after the era of salvation, a voluminous library of glossaries and onomastica, lexica of rare terms, classical terms, idiomatic terms, appeared under the auspices of Tryphon (30 A.C.), Diogenianus (130 A.C.), Pamphilus, Julius Pollux (A.D. 180), and, at a later period, Hesychius and Suidas. Their great defect, however, was that they had no complete dictionary in a comprehensive form; that the philological, and the historical, or descriptive departments were often confused; and that they were by no means uniformly arranged in alphabetical order.

² The ridiculous etymologies so gravely authorized by Quintilian are probably familiar to every scholar. The celebrated *lucus a non lucendo* he is responsible for. On the same principle—the cool prefix of a negation—he derives *ludus* (a school), ‘quia longissimè a lusu!’ *verbum* he deduces *ab aere verberato*; but his bachelor prejudices are ludicrously evinced in the account he gives of the term *calibes*, which he connects with *cælites*, ‘quod onere gravissimo vacant,’ in his own gallant explanation. He might have been a better etymologist had he been a worse naturalist: aware of the solitary propensities of the blackbird, he ingeniously derives *merula* from *mera* (sola) *volans*!

which, on the one hand, prepared the way for the great Reformation of the sixteenth, gained, on the other, by this most memorable event of modern history, an unrestrained liberty of inquiry, and the feeling of the sacredness of national tongues. It thus opened the way to wider researches, at the same time that the discoveries of the Spaniards and Portuguese laid a new world open before the awakening European mind. Antonio Pignafetta, an Italian, collected lists of words out of the tongues of the tribes and nations through which he travelled.

‘But the only effective progress in linguistic philosophy and knowledge made by the sixteenth century, was due to classical philology, combined with the study of Hebrew. The necessity of explaining the Old Testament from its original language led to the study and comparison of Arabic, Syriac, and Aramaic; and it is only necessary to know the two great luminaries of France, Scaliger and Bochart, to form an idea of the extent and importance of the progress made in this field of science.

‘On this foundation the seventeenth century attempted to build, so far as its struggles for religious and civil liberty would allow. But, owing to the overwhelming power of the political and ecclesiastical reaction in the greater part of that century, all it achieved in this field was a cumbrous, uncritical superstructure of lexicography. There was no philosophical principle in the speculation of that century, nor any great historical problem to guide its philology, which could have led either towards physiological or philological discoveries concerning the tribes and languages of mankind.

‘The mighty genius of Bacon was, indeed, aware of the importance and mysterious nature of language. The first chapter of the sixth book *De Augmentis Scientiarum* contains ample proofs of both. He there enumerates among the *desiderata*, as a portion of the doctrine *De Organo Sermonis*, a treatise *De Notis Rerum*, by which he means a philosophical catalogue of real signs (*characteres reales*), corresponding with the number of radical words, and also a philosophical grammar. There is enough for centuries in both these problems. There is also much of wisdom implied in his general invaluable principles of induction and analogy; and it is to be regretted that these germs have not been hitherto fully developed. But Bacon himself did nothing towards that object, with respect to language. He neither developed the principles of grammar, nor of the formation of words; still less did he attempt a classification of languages, or try to establish a method of inquiry into their nature and origin.’—Vol. i. pp. 39—43.

The Chevalier then illustrates the further development of philological science, from the Baconian era to our own. The great object of Leibnitz, in the foundation of the Academy of Sciences at Berlin, as his memoir of 1700 proves, was to establish the study of the comparative philosophy of language; and to classify the then known languages in order to trace the genealogy of mankind. The torch, as it fell from the hands of Leibnitz, was rekindled, with additional lustre, by Blumenbach and Prichard. Previous to their researches, the philosophers of the eighteenth century had scorned the idea of the unity of the human race; and theologians had unhappily assisted them in making the Bible say, that God had created language as he had created man, and that language was not the act and work of man. Under the auspices of these eminent contributors to science,

the combined light of philology, physiology, ethnology and geography, was brought to bear upon the problem; and science supported the Scriptural theory of the original unity of the human species. There were, however, several stages of the philological arena yet to be traversed. What was the method of defining near or more distant relationship, and of distinguishing between historical and accidental, original and subsequent connexion between the languages of the earth? In the solution of these questions, the next step was taken by a German: and it was India, and the English researches into Sanskrit, which elicited that step. In 1808, Frederic Schlegel, in his 'Essay on the Language and Philosophy of the Hindoos,' fully established the decisive importance and precedence which grammatical forms ought to have over single words, in proving the affinities of language. By an application of his method, he triumphantly showed the intimate historical connexion between the Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Roman and Germanic languages. The new linguistic school of Germany followed up the impulse given by Schlegel; a host of writers successively traced the different branches of languages connected with the Sanskrit; the unscientific expression of 'Eastern languages' was abandoned by the learned; the circle of Indo-Germanic tongues was gradually enlarged, till it embraced the Lithuanian, the Slavonic, and, finally, all the languages of Celtic origin. It was thus that the *desiderata* of Bacon, and the fundamental idea of Leibnitz, had, to a considerable degree, been carried out by the gradual establishment of a method for analyzing a given language, and detecting its affinities with another of the same family. The next step was to unite, and examine philosophically and methodically, all the different forms of human language, with a full knowledge of all the modern discoveries. It was achieved in the posthumous work of Humboldt (1836), 'On the Diversity of the Formation of Human Language, and its Influence on the Intellectual Development of Mankind.' Commencing with the simplest elements of speech, he gradually proceeds to the construction of a sentence, as the expression of intellect and thought. He then shows that the Chinese—the opposite pole to the Sanskrit—is a perfect form in its kind. In examining, explaining, and comparing the different means used by different nations to render single words susceptible of signs, destined to mark their position in a sentence, he shows that all accomplish this more or less imperfectly, with the exception of the Sanskritic family, in which he gives the prize to the language of the Hellenes. Thus he is brought irresistibly to the result, that the Chinese tongue and the Sanskritic family represent the two extremes of all known formations of speech:

while he considers the Semitic languages as standing on the same line with the Sanskritic, in consequence of their decided tendency towards the system of inflexional forms.

We must now allow M. Bunsen to describe in his own terms the existing phase of philological research; to which we will subjoin his account of the latest results arising from the application of his principles to the meagre fragments, which are all that have hitherto been revealed, of the Etruscan tongue:

'Whatever,' he says, 'has been successfully achieved in behalf of linguistic science, has been obtained by the critical method of philological analysis. While valuing all materials for what they are worth, I do not think that crude glossaries of languages not understood are proper materials for comparative ethnology; and I consider all conjectures and systems built upon such materials, as below scientific consideration. It is also, I think, now more generally acknowledged, and, indeed, proved by incontestable facts, that all critical philological results must remain incomplete until they become historical. All philology must end in history; but the historical results of those linguistic researches are infinitely greater than many learned historians imagine. . . . If we examine the last of these inquiries, we shall find that those only which belong to what may be termed central ethnology, based upon comparative philology, have furnished any conclusive result. Almost all languages of nations which have a history and a literature, have been linguistically traced to Central Asia; and the only natural method which can ensure real progress, appears to be to increase this stock, by confronting progressively isolated phenomena with the now historical centre. But this must be done methodically. Whenever in Asia, in Europe, in Africa, or elsewhere, we find family groups of languages, we must, first of all, try to define the respective position of each member, or relation to the other portions of the same family. We shall then have to ascertain methodically the relative position of the different families. This relative position is a double one. First, that of the members among each other. Thus we shall gradually obtain African, American and Polynesian groups, organically arranged, and prepared for being elevated into the sphere of universal history. To find the proper place for each group in the history of tongues, is the second aim of this comparative examination. In order to obtain the desired results for both purposes, a twofold critical operation is required. First, a grammatical analysis of every single language, based upon native composition and speech. The second operation will be, to gather round a common centre all such languages as, by their grammar and construction, undeniably belong to one and the same family, and to endeavour to discover which of its branches exhibits the idiom in its greatest purity and perfection. The most ancient and best preserved must be placed at the head, as the representative of the family in the history of mankind. It is only when we have reached this point, that we may knock at the door of universal history, and demand admission for the hitherto isolated family into the historical stock.'—Vol. i. pp. 61—63.

In the second chapter, the last results of the Italic researches, as far as they affect the Etruscan problem, are given in the following terms:

'Niebuhr's historical criticism had put an end to a host of groundless and unscientific conjectures and dreams respecting the languages of primi-

tive Italy, and cleared the ground for solid linguistic research. For, as linguistic research is blind without philology, so is philology without history. Niebuhr's general tendency in language was distinction; and what he found to be essentially heterogeneous was likely to appear to him autochthonic, and original from the beginning. This was the case with the Etruscan. Disgusted with the unscrupulous and rambling method of Lanzi and his followers, who had ransacked the Greek dictionary, and drawn largely upon their own imaginations, and the credulity of their readers, in order to make the Etruscan language what its alphabet evidently is, an archaic form of the Hellenic, Niebuhr maintained that the Etruscan was a purely barbarous language; that it is wholly distinct from the other more or less Latinising tongues of Italy Proper, of the Apennines, and even of the Alps; that the ruling nations of Etruria came from the North; and that the roots of the language must be looked for in Rætia. This verdict of Niebuhr, so far from being shaken, is confirmed by all the serious and connected philological or historical researches which have been since instituted on the subject.

'It was, of course, this language which attracted, from the first appearance of Niebuhr's "Roman History," the united efforts of philologists and linguists. Ottfried Müller, in his truly learned work, "Die Etrusker," (1828), gave the first critical outlines of the grammar, as well as of the alphabet. In the lectures delivered by me at the Archæological Institute at Rome, I advanced the theory I still maintain, that the Etruscan bears strong marks of being a mixed language, from the circumstance of such grammatical forms as have been ascertained being evidently analogous to what we know of Indo-Germanic flexions; whereas the greater part of the words which occur in the inscriptions prove most provokingly heterogeneous. On the other hand, the Tyrrhenic glosses in Hesychius (if they be of any value), and the inscription found in 1836 at Agylla, under the ruins of Etruscan Cære, and illustrated by Lepsius, contain words much more akin to the Græco-Latin stock. I do not think that the abundance of vowels can be accounted for by the assumption that this, and some similar inscriptions, represent a more ancient period. Until we possess bilingual inscriptions of some extent, we shall be unable to interpret them; but we cannot be mistaken as to their sounding less barbarous, or more like Greek or Latin, than the others. If, then, we have in the Etruscan a Græco-Latinising grammar, and a mixed vocabulary, and apply to these phenomena the general theory of mixed language, it does not follow that the barbarous lexicographical elements are entirely un-Indo-Germanic; for Celtic, though decidedly barbarous, still forms a part of that family. But it does follow, from the analogy of all we know, that the groundwork of the language is indicated by the grammar, the indestructible badge of near kinship; and that, in its origin, the Etruscan was much more akin to Greek and Latin, and the other Italic languages, than that element, which forms in the monuments, (that of Agylla and some smaller ones excepted,) the predominant part of the vocabulary. A mixed language of this kind would be the natural consequence of a non-Italic tribe having taken possession of Tyrrhenia, or the Mediterranean part of Central Italy, subdued the Italic indigenous population, and finally adopted their language, as the Norman conquerors did that of the Saxons, or the Arabs that of Persia. The coincidence of this result of an independent linguistic research, with Niebuhr's demonstration of the Northern (Rætian) origin of the Etruscans, attested by inscriptions found in an uninterrupted line, from that Alpine land and the Tyrol down to Tarquinii, appeared to me remarkable; the two researches seem mutually to confirm each other. The intrinsic nature of the language, as we find it in the monuments, leads also to the conclusion that the Greek words were a foreign element, received, but not

understood. Making every allowance for a different system of vocalisation, such changes as

Pultuke from Polynikes, Akhmiem from Agamemnon, are unmistakably barbarous, and betray an absolute ignorance of the elements of which the Greek name is composed.

'Thus *atrium* may have been inorganically formed from *ἀτθρον*. But as to *haruspex*, which is also said to be an Etruscan word, we shall see below¹ that it is thoroughly Latin, and has its Indo-Germanic root; it may, for all that, have been Etruscan, but it is not a corruption of *λερσοκόπος*. Both also may have been words of the conquered Helleno-Italic population of Etruria. Indeed, *versus*, "a square of one hundred feet," is quoted as being both Tuscan and Umbrian; and it is admitted that the Umbrians originally occupied Tyrrhenia.'—Vol. i. pp. 84—87.

Subjoined is Dr. Aufrecht's report of the last results of his Etruscan researches:

'The convincing proofs of the Indo-European character of the Etruscan grammar, are principally the following facts:

'1. On the Cippus Penninus we find the following forms of the word Velthina:

Velthina, Velthinas, Velthinam.

That *s* is the genitive termination, as in the other Indo-European languages, is undeniable.

'2. We find *a*, *ia*, the termination of female names, exactly as in Greek and Latin.

'3. *Al* is the patronymic and metronymic termination, which evidently corresponds with the Latin *Alis*, as in *Australis*, *Arvalis*, *Triumphalis*.

'4. *Sa* added to a man's name indicates the name of his wife; thus *Larthial—i—sa* means the consort of the son of *Larthius*. This form also bears the character of the Indo-Germanic languages, while that syllable has a genitive signification. In a similar way, the Greek genitive in *οιο*, originally *οοιο*, is not properly a case, but an adjective, *ιππο—σ—ιο* = equestria. The barbarous sound of the words in the Etruscan inscriptions, certainly cannot be explained by the accumulation of consonants alone; for earlier inscriptions, (that of *Agylla* and some shorter ones,) have many more vowels than the later. The only admissible explanation of this phenomenon is the assumption, that the Etruscan is a mixed language. We have abundant examples that the consequence of a mixture of two very different languages is, that they both become decomposed, and lose their former clearness, lexically as well as etymologically. I assume it to be a historical fact, that the conquering Etruscans took Tyrrhenia from the Umbrians; and I deny the historical existence of *Pelasgi* in Italy, whether their language were akin to Greek or not.

'I have, therefore, adopted another mode of getting nearer to the barbarous element in Etruscan. The Euganean inscriptions which are found in the southern part of *Rætia*, as well as in Lombardy, particularly about *Padua*, and other ancient inscriptions which have come to light in that district, exhibit the same alphabet, (except that the *O* occurs in them, which is unknown in Southern Etruria,) and a language, which, in its character, bears strong resemblance to the Etruscan. But I abstain from following up this conjecture until new monuments come to our aid.'

As long as there is no bilingual monument of any extent, the full fruits of Dr. Freund's mission to *Rætia* by the Berlin

¹ He supposes it had a common root with *hariclus*, and meant simply to observe the entrails of victims.

Academy of Sciences, to which allusion was made in our former article, cannot be reaped. The last researches instituted on the specific Romanic language now spoken there, having shown that, beside the ordinary Romanic words, and some roots bearing a Celtic character, there remained about one-tenth which could not be reduced to either, he engaged in this expedition, with the view of examining this mysterious *caput mortuum*. He discovered a far greater number of the words of that primitive residue than he expected. The fact of their existence is of great importance; but it will be difficult to identify them, until a monument, of the character described above, shall have been discovered.

In pronouncing the Etruscan to be a mixed language, the results of philology conspire with ethnological conclusions. The national civilization is obviously similar in character; it has its Oriental, it has its classical affinities; but the latter never formed the prevalent type. The Etruscan influence in Italy presents many points of analogy to the Moorish dominion in Spain; the Moors left no enduring legacy of arts and social culture to posterity, and the Etruscans, though brought into intimate connexion with the two noblest nations of antiquity, never attained to Greek and Roman humanities.

Up to the present time, then, modern research has only effected for Etruria the discovery, that her language belongs to the Indo-European family; with what elements it was blended, what was its relationship to other members of the same family, is a question still to be cleared up; its obscurity can only be dispelled by the discovery of monumental remains and inscriptions, to which a scientific philological theory may be applied.

Before closing this article, it may be well to point to the elucidation which recent researches have given to a well-known remark of Niebuhr, who, in illustrating his belief that the Latin was a mixed language, referred to the fact that, whereas the words belonging to the sphere of peaceable rural life agree in Greek and Latin, the Latin expressions for everything belonging to warfare, arms, and hunting, have no words corresponding to them in Greek. Upon this illustration Dr. Arnold founded the gratuitous illusion, 'that the Latin people arose out of a conquest of the Pelasgians (the Greek element) by the Oscans; so that the latter were the ruling class of the united nation, the former were its subjects.'—*Roman History*, vol. i. p. 22.

This is a mere conjecture, which ought not to have been intruded, in its peremptory dogmatic form, as an undoubted historical conclusion. It is entirely unauthorized by subsequent discovery; comparative philology shows the fact referred to to be

of general occurrence in the Indo-Germanic languages. 'It must, therefore,' observes Dr. Aufrecht, 'be explained in a manner applicable to all, by the circumstance that those nations once lived as peaceable herdsmen,' (the primitive occupation of the human race,) 'and, in part, at least, as agriculturists, in their original Asiatic abodes.' Thus, the names of the most important domestic animals, and only a few of the wild beasts, as wolf and bear, and the words for primitive wants, (breadstuffs, metals, names of consanguinity and affinity in their furthest extensions,) are, as we must naturally expect, found to be identical, not only in Greek and Latin, but also in the Germanic,¹ Lithuanian, and Slavonic languages. 'These words, therefore,' says the learned Doctor, 'are the Asiatic heir-loom of the civilized nations of Europe.' So that, if we find, in the different branches of this stock, different words for the implements of hunting and warfare, we must conclude that they were fixed after the separation took place. In Greek and Latin, however, the diverging terms quoted by Niebuhr, in proof of a mixture, are generally reducible to roots common to all the branches. The natural explanation of this is, that the Greeks and Romans lived longer together, and adopted in common, about the same period, a more southerly direction; whereas the Germans and Slavonics took, or kept in common, a more northerly one.

¹ *E.g.* Mother, Osc. amma; old high Germ. amma; compare Ger. amme (nurse); Icelandic, amma (grandmother); Sanskrit, amā. The Italic expression for man, in opposition to woman, is, Lat. Vir; Umbr. Veir; Teut. Ver; in Skr. Vīras.

² Dr. Aufrecht exhibits, in proof of this, the etymology of the very words chosen by Niebuhr as instances. *Scutum* is the Greek σκῦτος, from the root sku, 'to cover'; *Parma*, πάρμη; *Jaculum*, from jacere, λάττω; *Arma*, from arcere, 'that which defends, wards off'; Gr. ἀρκεῖν, ἀλλάκειν. In some others mentioned by him the resemblance is far-fetched.

ART. VI.—1. *Census of Great Britain, 1851. Education. England and Wales. Report and Tables.* London, 1854.

2. *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education.* London, 1854.

No department of the Census of 1851, is probably more calculated to produce some practical results than that of education. The secular or general census of the whole population, contains indeed much useful and curious information, which may, in the working of political economy, be turned to valuable account; but in dealing with it, we seem to have before us those great stubborn facts of human life, which are beyond any direct or voluntary control. Births and deaths, or the various ages to which different sexes and classes attain, according to their pursuits or occupations, are, in great measure, facts that remain uninfluenced in the future by the knowledge of the past. They are governed by stern laws of necessity, which act on the inner self of each individual rather than on the community as a whole, and which are beyond any combined or legislative efforts materially to change. The mass or substance on which it is necessary here to operate, is no less than the community itself; it cannot be viewed in the light of an external object to be dealt with as improved knowledge shall direct; but the most we can reasonably hope for, is that our own discretion, with a few compulsory hints, may teach us as a people to become better, wiser, cleaner, more sober, and, therefore, more likely to escape certain evils, which follow the neglect of prudent and wholesome counsel. Much the same may be said of the census of religion; that kind of knowledge which statistics give to the mind, has not much affinity with matters of faith, or the choice of a religion. It is hopeless to expect that any very direct influence can be brought to bear on the public at large, simply from the knowledge of certain varieties in the religious choice of individuals, who act in each case from strong personal motives, far outweighing in importance any effects of a census-table, and over which we have no control.

With regard, however, to education, there is this difference. A distinct subject-matter exists, which is external to ourselves, and with which, moreover, there is felt a very general, and almost unanimous, desire to deal, in an active and practical

manner; to aid which desire was doubtless the object for which the Census was drawn up.

We have, in the reports now before us, to do with the period of human life ranging between 3 and 15. This is a malleable age in itself, and, moreover, it is a period of life which grown-up people, who manage the affairs of the world, will not personally have to encounter any more.

Yet although we may hope for much good, from the information and stimulus imparted to the subject of education by the disclosures of the Census, it does not follow that those disclosures are peculiarly full or correct. In no department of the work were there more difficulties, or more chances of inaccurate statements. Very great opposition had to be encountered at the last moment; and it was discovered that there was no power to compel masters of schools to answer the questions that were thought necessary. It was even in contemplation to abandon the whole inquiry, and that after forms had been distributed to all parts of the country. It was judged, however, advisable to collect, on a purely voluntary basis, what information was possible; leaving the success of the undertaking to the good-will of those whose cooperation was essential. The proper schedules were accordingly sent to 70,000 heads of schools. Owing to the indifference, partly of the census-officers, and partly of the heads of schools, it was afterwards discovered, that with regard to a considerable number of schools, no information had been given. The large amount, however, of useful returns that were promptly received, encouraged the effort to arrive at a greater degree of completeness. A year's close correspondence was necessary for this purpose, and eventually the success was so far greater than had been anticipated, that the tabulation of facts was determined on, upon a more elaborate design than at first had been intended.

The total result is, that returns have been received from 44,836 day-schools, (15,411 public, and 29,425 private;) from 23,137 sunday-schools; from 1545 evening-schools for adults; and from 1057 literary, scientific and mechanics' institutions. About 1,500 other schools, of different kinds, were also reported by the census-officers as not having sent in any returns. The total number of children estimated as attending day-schools, is 2,144,378, of whom 721,396 belong to private schools; while those who attend sunday-schools, are 2,407,642; a further number of 39,783 being reckoned as adult scholars at 1545 evening-schools.

Whether this may be considered satisfactory, is made to depend on the answers that can be given to the following questions:—

‘1st. Does the present state of education, as exhibited above, display considerable advance upon its state in former periods, so as to give evidence of progress?’

‘2d. What number of children, out of the population of England and Wales in 1851, should constantly be found at school?—involving the questions of school age, duration of school attendance, &c.

‘3d. What is the character of the instruction afforded to existing scholars?’
—*Census*, 1851, p. xv.

Under the head of the first question, it may almost be said, that popular education is the work of the present century. Sunday-schools date their first origin to Raikes of Gloucester, in 1781, and they seem to have prepared the way for an appreciation of learning, that ended in a general call for daily education. Whether popular education has always, in past ages, been neglected to the extent that it was the case when those who now are old men and women were boys and girls, is a question of historical interest, which we cannot now discuss; but certain it is, that those were days of literary ignorance, such as can now hardly be conceived. It is the common saying of old people, ‘There were no schools in my time,’ and such really appears to have been the case; indeed in many parts of the country, the existence of a school is still a novelty, and persons are even now to be found, who assert that education is out of place in those who have to earn their living by hard labour in the fields. Unhappily, the Church did not commence the educational movement; though, of late years, she has been the great practical instrument of it: even while they, who in political sentiments, succeed to the old ‘march of intellect’ schools, appear satisfied with empty declamations about national progress; themselves having taken no further part in the work, than that of hampering the real practical agencies of it.

‘The popular day-school epoch dates from 1796, when the youthful Quaker, Joseph Lancaster, began, in his father’s house in Southwark, to instruct the children of the poor. Enthusiastic in his calling, and benevolent to rashness in his disposition, he assumed towards his scholars more the character of guardian than of master; easily remitting to the poorer children even the scanty pittance charged, and often furnishing with food the most distressed. No wonder that his scholars multiplied with great rapidity: they numbered 90 ere he was 18 years old, and afterwards came pouring in upon him “like flocks of sheep,” till in 1798, they reached as many as 1,000.’—*Census*, 1851, p. xv.

Lancaster, however, was not the man to carry on what he had originated; indeed, his whole career marks him as a thoroughly incompetent man.

‘Ardent, visionary, destitute of worldly prudence, the very qualities which made him so successful as a teacher and a missionary in the cause of education, rendered him incapable as an administrator. His affairs became embarrassed: he himself was tossed about through varied troubles,

passing from a prison to prosperity, and then again reduced to bankruptcy; until, in 1818, he departed for America, where, after twenty years of suffering, brightened by some intervals of popularity but none of prudence, his life was terminated by an accident, in 1836, in the streets of New York.—*Census*, 1851, p. xvi.

The prominent result of this unfortunate man's system when committed to abler hands, was the foundation in 1808, of 'The British and Foreign School Society,' called at first, 'The 'Royal Lancasterian Institution for Promoting the Education of 'the Children of the Poor.'

The monitorial system, which was the main feature of these schools, had been employed for some years by Dr. Bell, in the Military Orphan School at Madras. The following brief memoir of this distinguished name in the history of education, is worthy of attention.

'Andrew Bell was the very opposite of Joseph Lancaster, in all except a common enthusiasm for instruction on the "mutual" or "monitorial" system. A Scotchman, (the son of a barber of Saint Andrew's), his career was just as much distinguished by invariable prudence as was Lancaster's by constant though benevolent improvidence. On leaving college in 1774, at the age of twenty-one, Bell went to America, and spent his next five years as a tutor in Virginia, whence in 1781, he returned to England, having suffered shipwreck on his passage. He now took orders in the English Church, and became the minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Leith. Applying for a Doctor's degree in Divinity, he received instead, from the University of Saint Andrew's, one in Medicine. In 1787 he sailed for India, where he was appointed chaplain to five or six regiments. On the foundation of the Military Orphan Asylum, he became its honorary superintendent; and it was in this capacity that he made his experiment in "mutual instruction." The result of this experiment he published, after his return to England in 1797, and made strenuous efforts to procure the general adoption of his scheme. In 1801 he became rector of Swanage, Dorsetshire; in 1808 the master of Sherborne Hospital; in 1818 a prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, and subsequently one of Westminster. He died in 1832, bequeathing his large fortune of 120,000*l.* principally to the Educational Institutions of his native country. It is, however in connexion with the National Society that Dr. Bell is chiefly known.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xvi.

Since the establishment of the National Society in 1811, the Church has assumed a very prominent position in the education of the poor. Parliamentary returns were obtained in 1818, of the number of schools and scholars throughout the country, when the former amounted to 19,230 day, and 5,463 Sunday-schools; and the latter to 674,883 day, and 477,225 Sunday-scholars; the proportion of these to the population being 1 in 17 at day, and 1 in 24 at Sunday-schools. In 1833 similar returns were made out, and the numbers were respectively about doubled in day-schools, and nearly trebled in Sunday-schools; so that, although the population had increased nearly 24 per cent. in those 15 years, yet the proportion of scholars to

population was brought down to 1 in 11, and 1 in 9, instead of the proportion mentioned of the former period.

From the year 1833 are to be dated those annual government grants in aid of day-schools, the management of which, has been the cause of so much discussion. For six years a grant was made of 20,000*l.* and, for lack of any other plan of application, it was divided between the British and Foreign, and the National Societies, as representing the two great parties actively concerned in education. In 1839 some attempts were made to develop plans of state education; but the opposition that was met with, both from Churchmen and Dissenters, strongly brought out the fact, that education, in immediate connexion with different religious bodies, was more in favour with the public, than the direct agency of government. The duties of administering parliamentary grants were, at this time, transferred from the Treasury to the Committee of Privy Council on Education; the principle being also adopted of assisting, with the public money, the voluntary efforts of separate religious bodies, in proportion to their own exertions. The annual grants were also now increased; for three years they were 30,000*l.*, then 40,000*l.*; in 1845 they amounted to 75,000*l.*; for the two next years they were 100,000*l.*, in 1848-9-50, they came to 125,000*l.*; in 1851-2, to 150,000*l.*; and in 1853, to 260,000*l.* Of 500,000*l.* spent in England, between 1839 and 1850, almost entirely in the building of school-rooms, and the support of normal schools, it is satisfactory to the Church, that she, on the principle of distribution now adopted, obtained 405,000*l.*, while the Wesleyans only obtained 8,000*l.*, and the Roman Catholics 1,049. 51,000*l.* being given to the British and Foreign Society, leaving 37,000*l.* to Workhouse-schools, which, generally speaking, are under the influence of the clergy, and, therefore, may be considered Church schools.

The obvious importance which the system of state intervention now adopted gives to the education of the Church, in consequence of her own numerical majority, and her more complete organization, has excited much jealousy in some bodies of Dissenters, especially the Independents and Baptists, who, having formerly been the great advocates of state education—thinking thereby to undermine the influence of the Church—at once became its most rigid opponents, as soon as the result was proved to contradict their previous wishes. Various societies have sprung up, connected with these religious bodies, which have been the means of confirming more than ever the self-adopted principle of the English people, that the education of children shall be attached to the religious system of the country; and that, if the one is divided, the other shall be divided also.

The general result of all the activity which has been shown on the subject is sufficiently striking, when we find that; whereas in 1818 there was a day-scholar for every 17·25 persons of the whole population; and in 1833, one for every 11·27, there was in 1851, a scholar for every 8·36 persons. The increase between 1818 and 1851 was, of day-scholars, 218 per cent., and of Sunday-scholars, 404 per cent.; while the increase of population was but 54 per cent. How far we have accomplished what is requisite depends on other considerations, one of which is, whether the number of children now attending school is even yet as great as it should be.

What is the number, then, which, in a population of 17,927,609, ought to be found attending school? 1 in 8 is often assumed as a satisfactory proportion. This would amount to 2,240,951; and, on the supposition that all these were between the ages of 5 and 15, there might be, in this case, an average of 5 years at school for each child. When, however, we take into consideration, that many of the wealthier classes send their children to school for a much longer period, and that the poorer classes often send theirs at a younger age than 5, it follows that the average period of profitable schooling, *i.e.* between 5 and 15 years of age, among the poor, will be reduced considerably below 5 years, probably to 4 years. The deficiency shown in the present census below this assumed 1 in 8, is only 96,573; the actual number of scholars being that much below the 2,240,951. Mr. Horace Mann is not, however, satisfied with this abstract 1 in 8; he takes the whole population of England and Wales, and proceeds to find out, by a calculation of his own, how many ought to be at school.

Between the ages of 3 and 15 there are 4,908,696 children. Here, then, is the material out of which to make schools. About 1,000,000 of this number is at once disposed of, as being employed in various kinds of labour, manufacturing and agricultural; the permanently sick are reckoned at 195,000; those who are educated at home at 50,000; there are then left 3,663,261, between 3 and 15 years of age, who might be at school. As, however, the age between 3 and 5 is not of much profit at school, and as, therefore, it is not thought desirable to promote such early attendance beyond what is practically found to be the case, we have to deduct from this number all between those ages who are not actually at school or otherwise employed. This number is estimated at 574,611. Again, as attendance at school after 12 until 15, however desirable, is hardly to be expected among the working classes, we have to deduct also all between those ages, who, as before, are not actually at school or otherwise employed; estimated at 73,245. After all these deductions, the

residue is 3,015,405, or one-sixth of the population, consisting of all between 5 and 12 not kept from school by any sufficient cause, and all between 3 and 5, or 12 and 15, who are at present actually sent to school of free choice. This is the true number to be compared with the census return of 2,144,378, in order to judge whether the amount of our present educational plans are satisfactory or not. There is, then, a deficiency of no less than 970,000, which number of children are detained from school between the ages of 5 and 12. It does not, however, follow that these children never see a school, while all the rest, 2,000,000 and more, devote the whole 7 years to study. We must divide the time actually spent in school, in a fairer proportion, between the whole number. Mr. Mann's deduction is as follows:—

'If we have recourse to the opinions and experience of able writers and instructors on this point, the inference seems to be, that, while among the middle and upper classes the average time expended on their children's school-education is about six years, the average time amongst the labouring classes cannot much exceed four years. If this be so, the inference appears inevitable, that very few children are *completely* uninstructed; nearly all, at some time or another of their childhood, see the inside of a school-room, although some do little more. Upon no other supposition can the constant presence on the school books of the names of upwards of 2,000,000 children between three and fifteen, out of 4,908,696, be consistent with a brief school period for any considerable portion of the former number.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xxx.

No less a number, then, than 3,000,000 would be satisfactory, as representing the total children on the books of day-schools; especially when it is remembered that the actual attendance is somewhat irregular among the poor. Mr. Mann says, that in private schools the attendance, on an average, is 91 per cent. of the number on the books, while in public schools the per-centage is only 79. Even this, we think, hardly describes the extreme irregularity of attendance occasioned by the demand for youthful labour, at particular seasons of the year, in agricultural districts. The whole of the autumn, indeed, from the harvest to Christmas, is broken in upon, to the destruction of any real work, by the practice of using large gangs of children to dibble in the seed-corn, and to perform other processes of modern farming. From the beginning of August to January, the attendance of the elder school-children, in corn-growing countries, is so occasional and uncertain, that, with the commencement of every year, it is almost necessary to begin education afresh. This periodical irregularity hardly enters, we think, into the calculation of the census, which was taken at the very best time of the year,—in the middle of that seven months, from January to August, which is the great season or term for rustic education. The power of remedying these irregularities of day instruction by systematic

evening-schools is suggested, but not discussed, by Mr. Mann, as no inquiries of an efficient kind were instituted at the census. Indeed, the principle is not yet sufficiently developed for statistical information. Everything, however, points to the necessity of them, if the demand for youthful labour is continued, and, at the same time, the cause of education advances. What hope is there for the rising generation, if all education ceases at 10 or 11 years of age,—if from that time every kind of influence over them is lost, and all mental culture, as well as religious teaching, is left to chance, and to voluntary aspiration on the part of children themselves?

The next consideration touched on by Mr. Mann, is the quality of existing instruction in day-schools. Questions were asked as to the subjects taught in every school, and the number of children learning each. Any one who has had to do with the filling-up of such returns, will not place any very great reliance on the accuracy of the details that can be put together out of a country school; especially when 100 or so of little children have to be classified in almost as many different ways, and the brains of the teacher are confused by the multiplicity of questions. Still, however, some such details have been arrived at, which in the mass may probably be useful, especially in testifying to the small instruction given; for errors would be more likely to arise in overstating, than in understating, the amount of learning imparted. It appears that out of 33,993 boys'-schools from which information was obtained, there were 10,000 in which writing was not taught, and 20,000 in which geography was not taught. Again, out of 1,818,024 children of whom some details have been ascertained, it appears that 200,000 do not even learn to read, while nearly 800,000 do not learn to write, and 900,000, or one-half, do not learn arithmetic. About 30 per cent. learn grammar and geography, while other branches of learning fall to a per-centage that is wholly insignificant; for instance, modern and ancient languages, 4 per cent., and mathematics, 3 per cent.

Mr. Mann's deductions from this are very true:—

'To find in the schools a large proportion of the children learning the mere rudiments of knowledge, while a small proportion only is engaged upon the higher branches, must be looked upon as an unfavourable sign; revealing probably a limited duration of instruction—received, too, at an early age. And when it is remembered that, of those who appear to have been engaged in the more advanced departments of instruction, a majority were probably belonging to the upper and the middle classes, a preceding speculation seems to be corroborated, that the children of the working classes go to school while very young, and remain but for a very scanty period.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xxxiii.

On the subject, however, of the *quality* of education, we must

consider the efficiency of the teacher as well as the age and regularity of the pupil. The standard of remuneration given is applied to a large number of teachers, as some means of estimating the value of their services. The counties of Lancaster and Lincoln were selected for special inquiries under this head. In the former county, an average being taken of 301 masters, their salary per annum amounts to 58*l.* each; of 275 mistresses, the average is 31*l.* There are also, in boys'-schools, 132 paid monitors, with an average of 9*l.* 10*s.* each, and in girls'-schools 275, with 6*l.* 16*s.* each. In Church of England schools, the average pay of masters is also 58*l.*, the same as the average of all others. The masterships under the head of military schools help to lower the average, being only 18*l.*, which needs probably some explanation. Union workhouses only give 46*l.*, considerably below the average. Independents are more liberal, giving 81*l.* Quakers and Unitarians give more than 70*l.*, and Methodists 63*l.* Smaller religious sects and ragged-schools, &c. give less than the average, the lowest sum put down being 33*l.* The same relative proportions apply, without much alteration, to mistresses in this country. In Lincolnshire the average pay of masters generally is 74*l.*, but the higher standard is made up by collegiate and grammar schools, the pay of masters in national schools averaging only 50*l.*, and in other Church schools only 28*l.* Wesleyan Methodists in this county average 61*l.*, and British schools 78*l.* Mistresses in this county receive an average of 24*l.*, which is also much lower than in Lancashire.

Questions about remuneration are doubtless more difficult to get answered correctly than any other. In the first place, there is always jealousy, on the part of trustees and managers, to name the exact amount, even if they are able, especially where the school is in private hands, or maintained, perhaps, by a single individual; and in the second place, there are often various arrangements, with regard to the children's pence, or the residence of the master, or the amalgamation of his school duties with other parochial offices, which make it difficult to estimate with any exactness what his total income may be. It would, however, seem to be ascertained, that masters are better paid in manufacturing than in rural districts, and that they share in the general advance of wages which distinguish the one from the other. It is, however, fair to state that little dependence can be placed on these comparative tables of income, drawn up by Mr. Mann, as it appears on inspection that only 18 masters of parochial schools in the whole county of Lincoln sent in returns which he was able to use on this subject, a fact which completely destroys any statistical use of the table, though it may suggest speculations that in all probability the average of 50*l.* which

these 18 supply would be lessened rather than raised, if all the rest had been included in the calculation. There are, indeed, 56 mistresses of Church of England schools put down in this table, which may imply that the list of male teachers is less incomplete than at first sight would appear in so large a county; but, their average salary being only 24*l.*, the former presumption of the inferior nature of education in this rural district is not altered, for mistresses can only teach boys while very young. The large number of endowed schools in this county, 48, may, perhaps, account for the prevalence of mistresses in parochial schools, inasmuch as they relieve them, in some measure, of the elder boys; although, from the specimens of rural endowed schools which have come to our knowledge, we do not place much confidence in their general usefulness, in educating the labouring classes.

One of the great elements of hope, on the subject of education, is the great increase, of late years, of training-colleges for masters. By this means the position of the school-master in a parish will ultimately be very much raised, and, as a consequence, his school much improved. At present there are about 40 of these in England and Wales, which are supported at a cost of 90,000*l.*, 34 of them being in connexion with the Church of England. The system, also, of monitors paid by government grants, and of enabling the most promising of such monitors to follow up their occupation of teaching, by becoming 'Queen's Scholars,' and receiving from 20*l.* to 25*l.* a-year at a training-college; all this, if managed well, and in such a spirit and temper, on the part of the Privy Council and its army of inspectors, &c. as can succeed in making local and voluntary efforts cooperate with them, cannot but produce a vast improvement in the ability and general position of school-masters. Much of this usefulness, however, may be marred, if the Privy Council, in its general arrangements, is not sufficiently considerate of the wishes and sentiments of religious bodies, and of the Church, equally with others; or if, in its particular communications with local managers, during the inspection of schools, there is not courtesy and tact enough to avoid all appearance of domineering over the clergy, the masters, or any voluntary assistants in a school.

It has been already shown that, according to Mr. Mann's calculation, there were, in 1851, 968,557 children absent from day-schools, for whom no excuse could be given. There was that number short of the 3,000,000 who ought to be always on the books of some school or other. The proportion to the whole population which this implies is 16·8 per cent., or 1 in 6; and the question which occurs after this, is, whether each sex

ought to furnish equal proportions. It appears that the deficiency, at the census, was less in the case of boys than of girls; there were 13·2 per cent. of boys, and only 10·8 of girls. Nor is this proportion altered more than about one-tenth per cent., if scholars *at home* are included. Girls, therefore, are less educated than boys, and 600,000 of the whole number of unexplained cases of absence would be of this sex. Again, it is asked whether every locality should furnish an equal proportion of scholars. The larger and more constant demand for youthful labour in manufacturing districts, makes the proportion in them somewhat less than in agricultural counties. The per-centage varies, in England, from about 15 to 9 per cent, South Wales being still lower, only 8·6 per cent. The city of York and Westmoreland are the only places in which the 15 is exceeded. Hertford, Huntingdon, Rutland, Southampton, have 14. Berkshire, Cambridge, Cumberland, Dorset, Kent, Oxford, Sussex, Wilts, and the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire, have 13. Chester, Derby, Durham, Essex, Gloucester, Leicester, Lincoln, Norfolk, Northampton, Northumberland, Somerset, Suffolk, Surrey, and the West Riding of Yorkshire have 12. Buckingham, Devon, Nottingham, Salop, and Worcester, have 11. Bedford, Cornwall, Lancaster, Middlesex, Stafford, Warwick, have 10; while Hereford and Monmouth are the only counties which supply to day-schools only 9 per cent. of their population.

Various causes are discussed, to account for the deficiency in the number of children under the process of education. The want of school accommodation is not to be alleged as any excuse, for there is in very many places a redundancy, while in others the deficiency could easily be supplied, if there was any real anxiety for more room. Nor, again, is the school fee any very powerful barrier, even to the working classes, as may be seen by the little more concern taken in education, even where such fee, of a penny or twopence a-week, is not required. Much, however, of the absence from school which has to be deplored, exists in classes by no means the poorest; and when 50,000,000*l.* is annually spent by the labouring classes in strong drinks, it is justly imagined, that poverty is not the principal hindrance to the efficient education of children. The grand cause for the absence of children from school is the indifference of parents; so at least says Mr. Mann. He regrets the want of ambition in parents to give their children such an education as may enable them to improve their position in life. Nor does he confine this spirit to the lowest classes:—

* In general a parent, in whatever station, takes himself and his own social status as the standard up to which he purposes to educate his

offspring: the nobility, the gentry, merchants, tradesmen, artisans, and agricultural labourers expect to see their children occupying just the same positions as themselves, and not unnaturally seek to qualify them for no higher duties. Hence it is that only those whose after-life is destined to be spent in intellectual exercises, as the pastime of an affluent leisure, or the subject-matter of professional activity, prolong their educational career beyond the elementary school period. The children of the mercantile community are thought to have completed their instruction when they have become adapted for the counting-house; the sons of tradesmen when they have been fitted for apprentices; the sons of all engaged in manual industry as soon as they possess the manual strength and skill required for such pursuits.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xli.

The history of English society, for the last half-century, scarcely bears out this accusation; for perhaps a time has never existed, when there has been a greater amount of successful ambition of the kind here spoken of,—ambition which has used education as its chief instrument. The principal cause of regret is, we think, that mental culture is not valued for its own sake, as giving opportunities of moral advancement and of recreation to all classes;—it is only valued as a means of rising from a lower to a higher sphere, not as an instrument of improving the tastes and habits of each class as it at present exists. Yet, in spite of this, we cannot but concur, to some extent, with Mr. Mann's passing sneer at the tutoring which the labouring classes have, for some generations, been diligently subjected to, 'not to look beyond their station.' If station in life is a fixed thing, one great stimulus to education is certainly wanting, however we might desire that mental cultivation should be aimed at for its own sake.

Among the remedies proposed for the present indifference to education, Mr. Mann lays much stress on the importance of secondary education,—that is, of more opportunities than now exist for making use, in after-life, of what has been learnt in childhood:—

'If, after reading and writing have been mastered, more inducements could be offered for the frequent application of these arts in daily life, unquestionably fewer persons would be found unable, as at present, after some few years of manhood have elapsed, to read intelligibly, or to sign the marriage register except with marks. It is the goal in view that stimulates to perseverance in a tiresome course; but at present it must be, I fear, confessed, the working classes have no satisfactory reward to look to as the honourable end of their exertions. Much, no doubt, is now in process of accomplishment, for giving them increased facilities for gaining information; and mechanics' institutions, reading clubs, and, lately, borough libraries, have been established; but, in spite of these and other efforts, the extent to which the labouring multitudes are found engaged in intellectual recreation is surprisingly and sadly insignificant.'—*Census*, 1851, pp. xli, xlii.

Without any object, or ultimate use before it, Mr. Mann considers the elementary school to be 'little better than a *cul de*

sac.' At the same time it is most needful to improve the general character and system of primary schools, if only as a means of inducing children to prolong their stay, and thus of gaining more hold over their future tastes and habits. But in any improvement which is to be attempted, there comes the question of finance, which is thus introduced:

'Sir James Kay Shuttleworth computes that to provide an education of the character contemplated by the Minutes of 1846, for 1,836,562 scholars in public schools of religious bodies, would require a total annual sum of 2,890,845*l.* (exclusive of the cost of new school *buildings*); or an *increase*, on the present annual expenditure, of 1,844,265*l.* No question can exist that, whatsoever be the standard of efficiency to which it may be deemed desirable to raise the public schools, a very heavy further outlay, both for new erections and for annual support, will be required. And scarcely less will be the outlay necessary to establish and sustain those further institutions for promoting *secondary* education, without which the extension of mere primary instruction cannot be of much avail.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xliii.

The consideration of the means that might be necessary to arrive at any given standard, naturally brings Mr. Mann to the subject of the educational agencies that already exist. Hitherto he has dwelt mainly on schools and scholars in the mass, but now he divides them into their several species and kinds. The two chief points of interest to which we would now direct attention, in this subdivision, are the education of the middle classes, and the comparative influence of the Church among other religious bodies.

On the former point, Mr. Mann estimates that about 500,000 children, of the middle and upper classes, attend private schools. To these he adds 50,000, from the same classes, who attend public and grammar schools. On the supposition that these classes supply one-fourth of the whole number of children in the country, it is estimated that the children belonging to them have on an average $5\frac{1}{2}$ years of schooling. As, however, a further number of 50,000 receive instruction of a regular kind, under tutors and governesses at home, this average may be stated at 6 years. Calculations of this kind are, of course, based on suppositions, about which there may be various opinions in matters of fact. What authority, for instance, is there for naming one-fourth of the population, as the proportion belonging to the middle and upper classes, and, therefore, as supplying the 500,000, who are found to attend the better class of private schools? The average of 6 years, calculated in this way, for the children of the upper and middle classes, may not, therefore, be sufficient evidence, on which to found a positive charge of neglect, because it falls short of the 8 years that has generally been assumed to be the proper average of school attendance for these classes; yet, when it is remembered that,

in this estimate are included the upper classes and the wealthier of the middle, as well as the great mass of tradesmen and farmers,—and when it is granted, as we think it must be, that the former are, on the whole, well and sufficiently educated,—the average is probably far too low for the very large and important class of society which constitutes the latter. There is very little doubt, also, that the *quality* of middle class education is as deficient as the *quantity*. The following conclusion we, therefore, consider most just and true: ‘Good schools, on ‘reasonable terms, for children of the middle classes, are perhaps ‘more needed than new national or British schools.’

The want of such schools has long been felt, and successful efforts have been made, in some measure, to supply them. The greater number of endowed and grammar schools were intended by their founders to assist this class, but, from mismanagement, they have been too much appropriated, either by the rich on the one side, or by the purveyors of the most elementary instruction, on the other. Lord Brougham has estimated the value of endowments for education at 500,000*l.* a year; indeed there are as many as 4,021 schools, which are either wholly or partially maintained by endowments. In some cases the endowments are very small, amounting only to 5*l.*, and 904 of the above total number are between 20*l.* and 50*l.*; but even these, with special arrangements for the purpose, would form centres for other contributions, and for schools mainly self-supporting, far beyond what is now the case. There are, however, as many as 60 with endowments from 500*l.* to above 2,000*l.* a year, which, if not bound to local restrictions, could be applied with immense advantage to the general improvement of middle class education. No class is in more need of that particular guidance and assistance which endowed schools can give, than are small tradesmen and farmers. The education of the poorest classes is now acknowledged to form part of the parochial system, or of the efforts of the present generation in some form or other. Let it so continue, and let not the existence of endowments be made a pretext for saving the pockets of those, who otherwise would feel it incumbent on them to supply education for the poor of their neighbourhood. They were left not to relieve property of any just responsibility, but to assist children in obtaining a certain amount and kind of education which otherwise would not be supplied.

Mr. Mann thinks that the present tendency of education is towards centralization in large schools, without much intermixture of classes; each class, in fact, gathering together in large numbers. The old system of grammar schools was, no doubt, the very opposite to this; there was usually in them a

great mixture of classes from one locality. The facility of travelling and other reasons, would now, it seems, make it more popular to have schools composed of one class from many localities. The great object, however, being to aid good education in any way, we must be content to waive the question, whether the intermixture of classes is socially beneficial, and we must aid the plan which seems to be the natural tendency of the public mind. One consideration, however, naturally occurs as resulting from this change of educational prejudices; which is, that in any readjustment of school charities, at the hand of the Charitable Trust Commissioners, local restrictions should be permitted to have less sway, otherwise many schools will lose a great part of their usefulness, and be practically confined, not only to one locality, but one limited class of society in that locality.

It is always to be regretted when accidental restrictions, that were part of the natural system of a past age, and which, therefore, were introduced to foster the work of education as then conducted, should be actual impediments in the present age, because they militate against certain popular habits that are the natural growth of circumstances. Would it then be to take too much liberty with the letter of founders' wills, (we feel sure it would not be with their intentions,) to convert grammar schools into central middle schools, or even to amalgamate several foundations into one, in certain limits, and by this means establish good middle schools, such as, without being perfectly free, could yet afford to give a better education, under the management of better masters, than the payment of the scholars would allow? Schools, we think, might thus be founded, which would gain great favour with the class for whom they were meant.

Grammar schools, as at present managed, may be cheap for day-boys living in the immediate neighbourhood, but for boarders, where such are taken in, the terms are far too high to admit small tradesmen's sons; for it has been the universal aim of such schools to obtain gentlemen's sons only for boarders, who are supposed to make up, by high payments, for the smallness of the endowment. The result is, that the town boys are handed over to an inferior usher, while the better qualified head-master either does nothing, or in no way benefits that particular class whose efforts for a good education it is so desirable to encourage, and to help which was undoubtedly the object of the founders. This system is indeed much destroyed already, by the unwillingness of gentlemen to send their sons to any small grammar schools.

The centralizing principle, which has raised the large public

schools, has, in one sense, ruined small ones; surely then let these last find, in their present supposed decay, an urgent call to meet a pressing want in the lower middle classes. Let them throw themselves into the system of the age, and be the local centres of middle education in their several counties, as Eton and Harrow are the centres of a higher class, through the whole country.

In large towns it will still be compatible with this object, to retain the system of day-scholars in connexion with such endowments, for the population is all at hand. Much good also has been done of late, in making town grammar schools really useful to the middle classes. King Edward's School, in Birmingham, is a noble instance of the practical carrying out of this work: Every morning there pour in through its gateway about 400 town boys, sons of tradesmen, who there receive a free education from highly educated university men. There are also about twice that number in other schools, situated in different parts of the town, but supported by the same foundation. In rural districts, however, it would be necessary to establish cheap boarding-houses in connexion with such schools, as there would not be a sufficient number of boys, within daily reach of it, to take full advantage of its usefulness. By this means the sons of small farmers and country tradesmen might, at a comparatively small expense, perhaps not much exceeding 20*l.*, receive a really sound education, under circumstances far more advantageous than any at present enjoyed.

There is no class so little able to choose proper means of education, as those slightly removed from the lower. Nothing is supplied to them in an official and natural manner, as parish schools are supplied to the poor, and, therefore, they often give their children a sort of inferior home or day-school education, with an occasional quarter at a small private boarding school, about the character of which they know but little. These second-rate private boarding schools are, generally speaking, neither cheap enough, nor good enough, for the purpose (or we should have no wish to interfere with them); they are not cheap enough to retain scholars for any great length of time, and they are not good enough to impart any improved tone into the class of society that feeds them. Yet nothing is so desirable as to encourage boarding schools for this class. Boys are by their means taken out of reach of home prejudices, and of the faults which are but too common, in the every-day affairs of life, among the striving and somewhat worldly class of small traders. A higher tone of moral training can thus be imparted, than is possible in the short visits of a day-school. The mind is enlarged by intercourse with others of the same age, and the

conceits of a little shopkeeper's or publican's boy, (which are great, in the home neighbourhood, over the more humble labourer's son,) are brought to their proper level in that great tussle of school life, which a large school prefigures as the best preparation for the trials of manhood.

The ignorance of this class is at present universally acknowledged; and any clergyman who has prepared much for confirmation will have discovered, that the pupils of the parish school far exceed, in religious knowledge, the sons and daughters of the classes above them; who come, nevertheless, with the air of persons that are conferring an immense favour on a clergyman by condescending to be examined by him in common with the children of the poor. Middle class life, as such, is immersed in the cares of business, thinks only of what produces an immediate return of tangible worldly advantage, and, therefore, its whole atmosphere is the worst possible for the training of youth. Yet this is the class which is said to constitute the strength of a community like that of England. It is the active, rising, and energetic element which creates the wealth and supports the power of the country, nay, even governs the House of Commons. Of what vast importance, then, it is to provide good education for this class, is obvious. Everything that can be done to facilitate this end, ought to be adopted as a national good, not only for the sake of benefiting the individuals. For this reason, we think that foundation and grammar schools, where not left with other express injunctions—as they were originally intended for the lower middle class—should now also be so managed as most to aid them in providing good education for their children. They are specially capable, we think, of forming the common ground, on which the necessity for cheap middle education can meet the highest class of instructors, and on which the work can be conducted upon the highest principles of moral and intellectual training.

Unaided private enterprise has, however, begun this great work, and already shown that, whether the old foundations of the country can, or cannot, be freely engrafted into the educational spirit of the age, middle class cheap schools, conducted by men of the highest university distinction, are a clear want of the age, and, as such, are in process of being supplied. Hurstpierpoint is the most striking instance in point; we have not at hand the details of this establishment, but, from all we know, it answers in every way to the idea we have marked out. In many other counties the same plan is being adopted, with more or less success, sometimes in connexion with agricultural colleges, and sometimes as general schools, without any special object. There is no class of English society more in need of educational and social improvement than this, and there

are no means so likely to conduce to these ends, as the partial introduction of a collegiate system to the training of their children.

The present use made of endowed schools may be gathered, in some measure, from one of the numerous tables which Mr. Mann has worked out.* He divides endowed schools into collegiate and grammar schools, and other endowed schools. Under the former head it would appear that the highest kind of instruction is given, denoting that they are reserved for the higher classes. Ancient languages are taught in 71 out of every hundred, and mathematics in 67; while, under the latter head, ancient languages drop down to 7 per cent., and geography only numbers 51 per cent., thus signifying a very low standard of education imparted. Endowments seem thus divided between the high and low, while the middle classes have but little share in them. Surely this is just the reverse of what it ought to be; and, therefore, we would suggest that the Charity Commissioners, whatever their power may be, which seems a doubtful question, should, at any rate as long as they act at all, direct their attention to the best way of using the endowments for the benefit of that lower middle class, for whom we think they were generally meant.¹

That very many of our school endowments were intended for the middle classes, we think may be gathered, in some measure, from the date of their foundation. The last century produced no fewer than 1,334 of such endowments. Now, during that time popular education was hardly known; learning was thought of as the means of making a good apprentice, and of finally becoming Lord Mayor of London. Social elevation was the grand idol of the century, and in not a few memorable cases did the noble struggles of youth to obtain some share of learning, end in successful wealth and rank. Is it not, then, most probable that those endowments were meant to assist these efforts after social advancements, rather than to give the first elements of reading and writing to the very poorest. It is, indeed, specially provided for in many founders' wills, that children shall not be admitted into the benefit of the endowment till they know the first rudiments of learning, such as plain reading and writing.

Attempts have been made, in some parts of the country, to bring the children of the lower middle classes into the same school with the poor, charging them a higher fee, and giving them some few advantages. By this means, it has been hoped

¹ In consequence of some fault in the Act of Parliament, the Charity Commissioners are now obliged to make the humiliating confession, that they are not empowered to enforce the recommendation. We hope this will speedily be remedied.

that parish schools might be self-supporting. Mr. Kennedy, however, Inspector of Schools, strongly condemns this plan, as injurious to the interests of both, and opposed to the feelings of the middle class. He is not unconscious of the wants of this class, but he would supply them in other ways. His remarks are so much to the point that we extract them from the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, for 1853-4, just published:

‘Though I have deprecated the proposal of throwing open our national schools for the poor for the reception of the children of tradespeople, who can afford to pay higher school fees, I desire to add, that I am fully alive to the importance of the education of the middle classes, and of there being better schools for them than there are. What is wanted for the children of the small shopkeepers and skilled artisans is the converse of what is now needed for the poorer classes. Religious zeal, aided by the Parliamentary grant, has provided school-buildings for the poor, and there is a tolerable supervision of such schools; what they want is proper sustentation. Whereas, I have no doubt but that the lower middle classes would duly support good schools for their children; and their great want is suitable buildings and proper supervision. It appears to me that it would be a very great boon to these classes, and to the country, if the Committee of Council on Education would help them, not to support their schools, but simply to acquire suitable buildings, requiring the right of inspection as the condition of the grant towards the school-buildings.’—*Minutes*, pp. 756, 757.

Partial success has, nevertheless, attended the plan of mingling classes, and in some places there is no choice for farmers and tradesmen, who must either send their children to the national school or nowhere. The kind of separation, however, that is often allowed, sometimes absolutely marked by a curtain, is adverse to good discipline, and to the growth of right feeling. Except, therefore, in the case of very young children, it would certainly be productive of much good education, if all those classes, who can pay for their own schooling, should be provided with middle schools, and that, where possible, the children of this class should be trained up away from the associations of home.

It is time, however, that we now turn to the question of what influence the Church possesses in the present educational movement. Mr. Mann speaks with enthusiasm of ‘the inexhaustible resources and illimitable enterprises of religious zeal;’ he continues to state that ‘This insatiable benevolence has almost wholly reared, and is now in greater part sustaining, upwards of 10,000 day-schools, in which more than 1,000,000 children of the poorer classes are from day to day instructed.’

It is a natural object of regret that the good work of education should be the battle-field for sectarian oppositions. Her Majesty’s Inspectors evidently repine over the great hindrances thereby caused to the establishment of a more effective machinery.

How simple, for instance, would it be, to improve the education of any given town, if all parents in it were agreed on religious questions? There might then (a want which is much felt) be schools for different ages and degrees of proficiency; and the superior children might thus be assembled together from various smaller districts, and receive an education from such a well-qualified master as might perhaps be obtainable at the scale of one to each town, but cannot be had in every small parish or sect. At present, each parish and sect must begin and finish with all their pupils, and have a complete organization in itself. There is no cooperation, or division of labour, according to the qualifications of respective masters. The loss thereby incurred must, however, be endured with philosophy. These inconveniences form part of the data on which we have to act; the very causes of them are also the stimulants for much of the voluntary assistance which is obtained. If, therefore, the agents of government education, enraged, as they may justly be, with the folly of local disagreements, that cause so much waste of funds, and so much embarrassment of plans, should attempt to ride over these prejudices, they will, we fear, discover that voluntary aid is in a great measure withdrawn; and that they are no longer able to cooperate in a friendly spirit with the undoubted tendencies of the age on the subject of education.

The country is in fact now smarting for its religious divisions. We have boasted of toleration and freedom of opinion, and of the inestimable value of religious liberty. We do not question the soundness of the national judgment in wishing for these advantages, only let it be remembered that, if we are divided, we can no longer enjoy the many facilities and conveniences which are the reward of unity.

‘The extent,’ Mr. Mann says, ‘to which religious bodies are assuming the control of popular education is continually and rapidly increasing.’ Within the last ten years, no fewer than 4,604 school-buildings have been raised by religious bodies, which educate, probably, about 450,000 scholars; and the total voluntary contributions to schools of this nature are calculated at about 400,000*l*.

The number of schools under the head of Religious Denominations is 10,595, excluding schools, in which any endowment they may have is greater than the voluntary subscriptions of their conductors; and, with these, 12,708. The scholars belonging to this last number of schools are 1,188,786; and as the scholars are the real objects of interest, we shall take this number as the one by which to judge of the relative influence of different religious bodies. The whole number, then, of scholars under this head, is reckoned at 1,188,786, and of these the Church of England has no less than 929,474. The next largest number

down this column, is one of 780,597, belonging to British schools, not returned as being connected with any particular denomination. The residue, therefore, for all definite sects of Dissenters, is only 176,715. Of this the Independents have 50,000; the Methodists, 44,000; the Roman Catholics, 41,000; Baptists, 9,000; Unitarians, 4,000; Quakers, 3,000; and other smaller sects, numbers varying from 2,000 to 15.

The striking feature of this list is the great preponderance of Church schools, yet Mr. Mann seems chiefly to gather from it, with assumed official impartiality, that 'popular education is rapidly becoming a matter of *denominational* activity.' How this activity is henceforth to be conducted, is nevertheless a difficult question to answer, when the Church's share in the work is plainly stated; and Mr. Mann appears then almost to tremble for religious liberty, for he sees no probability of Dissenting bodies being, each of them, able to provide day-schools in every place. 'It even seems inevitable,' he says, 'at first sight, that, in the course of time, the mass of the population must gradually return to the Church of England.' Yet he consoles himself with the reflections that still linger in his memory, from the census of religious worship, and remarks, that if Church schools do educate four-fifths of the population, yet after the children are grown up, they alter this proportion between Church and Dissent to an equality of numbers. There is something like a sneer in the following sentence, which follows the notice of these facts.

'This appears to prove, that either the education given by the Church has been administered on very tolerant and liberal principles, or else the sectarian and doctrinal instruction of the day-school is extremely ineffective in comparison with those religious influences which the scholar meets elsewhere.'—*Census*, 1851, p. liv.

As might naturally be expected, the proportion of children in Church schools is greater throughout rural districts, and less in towns; for in them each sect has a better opportunity of setting up a school for itself. In Birmingham, the proportion to the population attending Church day-schools, is only 2·67 per cent., while in Wiltshire, it is 7·27. Still the great fact remains, that the Church is the instructor of the poorer classes; and that the National Society, together with Government grants and voluntary cooperation, are the vast engines by which the rising generation of the masses are now receiving their education. With regard even to the nominal share taken by Dissenters in this national work, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Her Majesty's Inspector of British, Wesleyan and Denominational Schools, for the Midland districts of England and Wales, makes, in his recent report, the following important disclosure, which proves how

little that share is; and which still further strengthens the position that the Church is the teacher of the *Masses*.

‘Nevertheless, while more and more convinced that the present elementary schools sufficiently educate the children who frequent them, and while more and more convinced that the central institutions sincerely desire to promote the education of the poor, I remain in the opinion which I last year expressed, that in the schools which I visit, and above all, in the Wesleyan schools which I visit, the children of the actually lowest, poorest classes in this country, of what are called the masses, are not, to speak generally, educated; that the children who are educated in them belong to a different class from these; and that, consequently, of the education of the masses, I, in the course of my official duty, see, strictly speaking, little or nothing.’—*Minutes*, p. 1046.

Roman Catholic schools would seem to form an exception to this exclusive principle of Dissent. Mr. Marshall, Inspector of these schools, relates the following instance as occurring in his experience.

‘I remember assisting, nearly five years ago, at an examination of some of the older girls, conducted by the accomplished superioress of the celebrated school at Kinsale, which lasted two or three hours, during which a considerable portion of the historical parts of the Old Testament was illustrated by references to contemporaneous profane history, and this with an intelligent accuracy which I was able to admire and appreciate, but certainly could not have imitated. And the children who displayed this remarkable knowledge belonged, I think with one exception, to the very poorest class of Irish labourers. It is true that they had almost all been brought up from infancy in the Kinsale school.’—*Ibid.* p. 1165.

This gentleman’s report of Roman Catholic schools is, in other respects, so much in their praise, that, at the risk of startling some Protestant ears, by the contemplation of a Government Inspector thus speaking of the teaching of Popery, we extract the following from the Minutes—how much abatement from its glowing eulogy will be made by such of our readers as remember that its author is ‘a recent’ and enthusiastic ‘convert,’ we shall not decide.

‘Of these it would certainly be more accurate to say, that never was a more efficient system of education developed, either in England or elsewhere. Others will present the testimony gathered by their own experience; for myself, I am bound to report, that I have visited many schools, in compliance with the instructions conveyed to me, in which the teaching, comparing it, as far as I am able, with whatever I have seen, either here or in other countries, is admirable in its intellectual character, and of which, nevertheless, this is the least merit. I do not know what standard of excellence people propose to themselves when they speak of what elementary schools *ought* to be; but I am sure that I have visited some, which, whether as respects the nature and amount of the instruction, the discipline and formation of character, or the building up of definite, abiding, and vigorous religious faith and religious practice, neither are nor can be surpassed in Europe.’—*Ibid.* p. 1169.

The impression that we should wish to see derived from this is, that the Roman Catholics possess their great power in

schools, because they are a religious body, and work as such. Feeling that they are on their trial in this country, they strive in all they do to put forward their religious character in the most prominent manner; and working with an outwardly marked religious system, they make it their steady aim to gain a permanent hold on the minds of children. They have an unusual stimulus just now, and, therefore, we would suggest that their success is to be traced, not to the specialities of their own system, but generally, to the force of definite religious education, conducted by zealous and well-trained religious instructors.

The Church of England has an immense power now in her hands, and also needs an unusual stimulus to enable her to take advantage of the opportunity. It is a reflection, however, of no small importance, that, as yet, her education does not retain scholars in her communion through after-life. The census of religious worship has, we have no doubt, been 'cooked,' and made to exaggerate the numbers of Dissent. Still, it is a fact that children come to Church schools for their education, and are not retained in her communion afterwards. They turn to Dissent, or to careless ways, and seem, a large proportion of them, to have received (most truly) no *sectarian bias* from the teaching of the Church, such as will attach them to her. As Mr. Mann gives but little information beyond figures, and as the general facts expressed by the figures seem plain enough, in this part of our subject, we propose to consult the report of the Government Inspectors for further hints and information, that may throw light on the present educational position of the Church of England.

Mr. Mann may call the part which is taken by the Church of England in education, *denominational*, or *sectarian*, but the fact is, that while different sects and parties select out of the whole mass of the population particular objects on which to devote their instructive energies, the Church of England has to undertake, not only her own hearty members, but all who are left behind by others, all those whom nobody else cares to entice, and all those whose parents most obstinately hang back from any willing cooperation in the work of teaching. That the Church of England is the national educator seems to be as freely acknowledged by Dissenters as by others, especially when it suits their purpose. We know an instance, where a Dissenter ignorantly asserted, that he had a right to send his boy to the Church day-school, in spite of the well-grounded refusal of the clergyman, because it was a *national* school, and, therefore, open to the whole *nation*. Such, then, being the case, we find that Church schools labour under great difficulties in their religious

training and teaching. The managers of a Church school may, on their part, consider their services as the work of the Church, but the mass of the people persist in looking on their schools as part of a national institution. The difficulty, then, of the Church is to maintain her acknowledged position as instructor of the poor, and also to preserve her distinctive religious teaching, or, if Mr. Mann prefers the word, her denominational character; and, to do this, if possible, in such a way as to retain her scholars in her communion after they are grown up to man's estate. Facts, at present, show that she does not succeed in this, as a whole; although particular instances, where her religious claims are strongly and practically put before the youthful mind, show that she has the power, if she does but exercise it. Her special difficulties arise from her large grasp, comprehending all shades of opinion and character; which bring out, to the disappointment of her plans, so great a variety of hindrances, either from indifference or direct opposition. The condition, therefore, of Church of England schools must not be judged of, as if they were specimens of what the Church, as a religious body, is able to do; but the special difficulties she has to encounter—tending so much to bring prominently out on the surface of her schools the chief national faults with regard to education—must be well considered at the same time that any criticisms are made on the actual value of what she does. We have, in short, to look on her schools as exemplifying the national character, quite as much as her own inclinations and sentiments.

It is, indeed, owing to the national indifference on the whole subject of education, that the work of the Church, situated as she is, does not accomplish her ends with more certainty; but as she does practically fail in many things, which it is much to be desired that she should accomplish, it is vain and useless to flatter Churchmen with a mere enumeration of so many hundred thousand children whom the Church is educating, without at the same time stating what the inspection of these schools brings to light. The presumption, already stated in connexion with the bare facts of the Census, that the large and promising numbers are too much composed of the irregular attendance of very little children, is strongly confirmed by the Inspectors, who all complain most bitterly of the very early age at which the children of the poor leave school for ever. Mr. Bellairs, Inspector for Gloucester, Oxford, &c. says:—

‘With reference to the different obstacles in our way, the most important is the removal of children from school at a very early age. The complaints on this head are as heavy and numerous as ever; boys and girls, in many instances, being taken away at 10, 9, and even 8 years of age. The evil of

this is very great. The boy removed from school at tender age leaves as an animal machine—his knowledge limited, his intelligence unawakened, and therefore his conscience, to a great extent, unenlightened. He commences and pursues life with little to guide him, save strong animal instincts and propensities. Intellectual pleasures, and the sweets of moral self-control, are to him unknown. His work is mere machinery; he is incapable of realizing the “why and the wherefore” in his daily occupations; his gratifications are sensual; his pleasures low and degrading. He goes to Church unable to follow the prayers, or to understand the sermon; his Bible, if able to read it, is to him, from his low intelligence and attainments, almost a sealed book. The wonders and goodness of God, as seen in creation, unfelt and unseen; and so life runs on, until at length, without provision for old age, or enlightened preparation for death, he becomes an inmate of the poor house, ere long to sink into his grave.’—*Minutes*, pp. 400, 401.

Mr. Cook, Inspector for Middlesex, &c. finds an improvement in this respect, inasmuch as there is a per-centage of almost 19 in his district who are above 12 years of age. This improvement, however, is not, he says, what ought to satisfy any friend of education. He suggests that it would be expedient to offer some inducements to the elder children to remain in school. Mr. Watkins’ report is concluded with the following remarks:—

‘This tender age of school children is the real educational evil—the giant mischief to which all others are mere dwarfs. It is, of course, well to attempt to do away with them; for, as they are removed, they show the monster evil more plainly, and, probably, in some degree, facilitate the approach to its removal also. But of this I am convinced, that no system of national education, which not only does not aim at, but, does not secure, the attendance of older children than those now at work in our schools, does anything really for the social or moral or religious progress of the country. The advocate of a purely secular system finds his stronghold here. He can point to the state of the country, and ask with triumph, —Where are the results of your religious education? It is quite true that they are mournfully small and unsatisfactory. But can anybody, who knows what child-nature is, and what are the ages of school-children, be surprised at this, or rationally expect more from the ever-shifting, almost infantine, population of elementary schools?’—*Ibid.* p. 494.

Mr. Douglas Tinling thus disparagingly reports of some schools in the Western counties:—

‘With regard to many of the smaller schools, I regret to state that it is impossible to realize that any great work is going on for good, either in moral and religious training, or in the simplest elements of school instruction.

‘The outward building stands as an acknowledgment of the necessity of the work, but the internal condition of the school shows that real education is not progressing.’—*Minutes*, pp. 561, 562.

The report of the Midland counties from Mr. Blandford is very explicit:—

‘The average age at which the children leave these schools is under ten years. Very few, not more than three per cent., remain till they are

fourteen; and only four per cent. continue over four years under instruction, their place being supplied by a constant succession of new-comers. The discouragement thus caused to a hard working conscientious teacher may easily be imagined, whilst to one who is the reverse, and only anxious to keep up the numbers of the school, it affords a ready excuse for idleness and inattention to duty.'—*Ibid.* p. 669.

Mr. Norris, Inspector for Cheshire, &c. informs us, that out of every 100 children under his inspection, he does not consider that more than 6 or 7 stay long enough to profit by their education. Nor would there seem, from Mr. Stewart's report of the Northern counties, to be much difference in the time allowed for education, between manufacturing and agricultural districts. He does not enter into the question of how many per cent. stay a given time at school; but he opens the veil on those children who are not under his official inspection, and accounts for their absence. His picture may be overdrawn, and certainly is an exceptional one; but it is an important fact worth recording, that a Government inspector of the 19th century should thus have to write:—

'If factory labour is so oppressive to the young as to awaken the paternal sympathies of Governments, surely a much keener jealousy ought to protect the mere infants that totter forth into the fields, with a dry crust of mouldy bread, to earn a few pence for a famished family by scaring birds. I have known children so worn out by this employment that they have crawled home at night-fall merely to die.'—*Ibid.* pp. 903, 904.

These extracts from the report of her Majesty's Inspectors may represent the dark side of the picture; but yet they are explicit and comprehensive, especially when we take into consideration that they apply, with increased force, to that whole class of children whose fate we are now discussing, *i.e.* the poorest, because those few who do remain till a later age, are probably the children not of this class, but of one a little better off.

It is, no doubt, the tendency of inspectors to require too much, and to be hasty in condemning that education, as utterly useless, which does not come up to their standard. Allowances must be made for the short time that popular education has really been attempted, and for the slowness with which the subject is even yet taken up by the great monied interests of the country; but still the work needs a constant stimulant, and those who have the practical management of schools in their hands, must maintain an ideal standard before them, far higher than the actual present working of the educational system. Without further stimulating—and that from powerful quarters—there is yet a chance of the cause falling back, and of the effort to teach the English poor proving abortive. Mr. Mann illustrates the present mode in which the life of childhood is passed from 3 to 15, by an ingenious coloured diagram, which,

at a glance up the several columns, exhibits the proportion at every age; of those who are scholars; of those who are employed; of those who are undescribed; and of those who are gradually departing altogether from mundane occupations after the commencement of their fourth year. From 3 to 6 the 'undescribed' predominate; but after that age the scholars, who have rapidly been increasing each year, gain a considerable advantage, arriving, however, at their climax before the age of 8 years. At this point the coloured portion that represents employment, and which is just discernible as a faint line for the two former years, begins to encroach on the scholars, at a much greater rate than it does on the undescribed. After 10 the scholars sink down very precipitately, till between 14 and 15 there are only 29,639 left in the whole country, on the male side of the picture, out of a total of 187,000. The female diagram chiefly differs from the other, from the increased extent of its 'undescribed regions,' to the sacrifice of the other two. There are also in the Census Report very elaborate tables, to show the nature of the employment to which children and young persons under 15 are subjected. This time of life is viewed under the three periods, into which the ages of 5 and 10 divide it. The labour of the first period does not appear valuable, and is not taken advantage of in any calling of life; there are, however, 114 reported as 'vagrants in barn, field, and tent.' The rest would seem to be dependent on relations or public bodies, and charities. Under the next era, from 5 to 10, more than 6,000 are classed as agricultural labourers, while cotton absorbs about 4,000, and wool in its different forms as many more. Lace and straw-plait require the labour of no less than 6,000 of these youthful toilers, and coal pits 1,220. The only other large item is 2,800, whose little feet are brought into action to run messages; domestic service also employs about 1,300. Under the last column, from 10 to 15, we come to much higher numbers: agriculture 110,000; cotton nearly 50,000; wool and silk as many; and coal mining 23,000.

Many other branches of industry also employ the labour of this age, in numbers proportioned to their own importance. With respect, however, to the younger of these children, thus classified as occupied in labour, it must be difficult to distinguish between such as are partially engaged in domestic service, manufactures, or field-work, whilst at the same time they attend school; and such as on the other hand are altogether absent from all means of education. In agriculture, especially, there are processes which occupy children in large numbers only for short intervals of the year; the school being open to them during the remainder. Are then the children thus classified distinct

from, or intermingled with, the other numbers, under the head of scholars? The period of the year at which the Census was taken, and the little difference in point of regularity of attendance between agricultural and other schools, as well as the necessity of making separate heads in the Census mount up to the proper total, would incline us to believe that these are distinct, and that the *occasional* labour of children is not reckoned. Still, however, whatever the attention, there must be considerable want of exactness in calculations that rest on so many ever-changing facts.

Some methodical system of half-time schools is a remedy to meet the present neglect of education, which seems forced on the attention of all concerned in this work. It appears to be a necessary part of our social habits, that the children of the poorest classes, both in agricultural and manufacturing classes, shall at the tender age of 10 be deprived of any further regular attendance at day-schools. If this be so, can no means be devised of practically meeting the case half-way? Evening-schools are in many places adopted with success, but, generally, we believe, they are more of adult schools, and are attended by persons above 15, who wish to make up for former neglect; and they are only carried on for a small portion of the year. Scarcely any information is given us about evening-schools for children; as Mr. Mann says that, 'compared with their importance, little has yet been done in this department.' From what information was obtained under the head of adult evening-schools, it appears that they are most numerous in the county of Lancashire and in the West Riding of Yorkshire, in the former of which 314 are reported, and in the latter 237. Chester has 78, Middlesex 76, and Norfolk 58, each having, on an average, about 20 scholars, rather more than two-thirds being of the male sex, chiefly agricultural labourers, artizans, or domestic servants. In the county of Suffolk, 100 fishermen are put down, which fact probably has some interesting story connected with it, if we could dive beneath the dry facts of a Census table. Of all the butcher-boys of England and Wales, it would seem that only 3 take advantage of this means of instruction; while, as if to contradict any assumption that the nature of their occupation brutalises the mind, the more innocent employment of milkmen only supplies a solitary devotee to nocturnal schooling.

It has been suggested, (and in some places attempted,) as another way of meeting the case, to have schools open from about ten o'clock till three, with only an interval of half-an-hour for dinner. This is chiefly for boys who clean shoes in the morning, and for girls who are similarly occupied in small domestic works, and who wish to get through their schooling at

one time. Some method of reconciling a certain amount of useful and remunerative labour with a certain amount also of instruction, seems to be, by common consent, a great want among the poorest classes. How to obtain this is the problem. Inasmuch as the design of it is a compromise between the school-master and the employer, it of course follows that the cooperation of the latter must be obtained; which again implies that the interests of property must feel the responsibility of providing education to a greater extent than is at present the case. Mr. Bellairs' testimony on this subject is thus:—

'My own impression is, that the only way in which to meet this difficulty would be by adopting a half-time system, and by applying to towns in general, and to agricultural places, the regulations which operate in manufacturing districts. How such a plan could be arranged just now I do not exactly see; but, if it could, the objections here alluded to might probably be avoided, viz., unfair taxation of the poor and loss of production to the country.'—*Minutes*, p. 402.

Literary, scientific, and mechanics' institutions form one subject of the Census, under the head of Secondary Education. 1,057 of these are reported; but there is a peculiar tendency in such institutions to exaggerate their real facts; and, therefore, we place but little confidence in the steady usefulness of the operations which might seem to be implied in the returns. Literary institutions not under good management are found often to become receptacles of second-rate vulgar novels, *instructive* in their way, but hardly to be considered as part of education. The vaguest schemes are also, in some cases, reported as accomplished facts, especially under the head of mechanics' institutions. We know of a clergyman who was surprised to learn, for the first time, in this census return that the place of his residence possessed a mechanics' institution, with a library of 1,700 volumes, a numerous body of subscribers, and lectures on science and the arts. On making inquiry, which in a population no larger than the size of the alleged library was not difficult, he gathered that there was a *scheme* of the kind started in 1851, and that a certain closet, which was seldom opened, was supposed to contain a considerable number of Chambers' Journal, and a few other old periodicals. The idealists of 1851 were much surprised to find their long-forgotten schemes assume so bold a form in the census tables now published.

One important element of our present system of instruction still remains to be considered, about which the Census gives many particulars that are interesting, if really fulfilled in actual life. We refer to Sunday-schools, as wholly distinct from day-schools, both in management and in general design. Mr. Mann enters on this subject with a warmth and animation of style that betrays the consciousness of being, for some reason or other, in

an atmosphere of facts and figures that coincide with some favourite ideas of his own, more than had been the case in the statistics of day-schools. The plans and tables which he had drawn out, to exhibit the *denominational* agencies of day-schools, had often too rudely dealt with the whole principle of the equality of religious sects, by containing large figures opposite the words 'Church of England,' while the rest of the page was almost a blank. On Sunday, however, it would appear that Dissenters rouse themselves, and assert a position, in comparison with the Church, more approaching to the revelations of religious worship. To illustrate this difference, we must remember that in day-schools supported by religious bodies, the Church of England educates 924,474 out of a total of 1,188,786. It appears, however, that on Sunday the total number of scholars are 2,369,039, while those belonging to the Church of England are only 935,892,—10,000 more than the number of day-scholars. Against this sabbatical increase of only 10,000 on the part of the Church, the Dissenters show an increase in their schools of more than 1,000,000. The Independents, who only muster 50,000 in the week, have 343,000 on the Sunday; the Methodists have also about 50,000 in the week, but are stated to muster on the Sunday, through their several branches and connexions, the immense number of 750,000. The Roman Catholics, on the other hand, have only 33,000 on Sunday, which is 10,000 less than the number of day-scholars. The multitudes of those *taught* require a corresponding number of *teachers*, who are said to amount to 318,135. These figures, Mr. Mann justly observes, will create a feeling of surprise; and as he is conscious that 'the opinions actually expressed by 'public writers of the value of the Sunday-school considerably 'vary,' he proceeds to explain, at some length, the nature and working of these institutions. After stating that secular instruction is only imparted as the means of acquiring religious, and, therefore, of furthering the special object of these schools, he continues:—

'In general, every local Sunday-school is the offshoot of an individual congregation, from the midst of which the teachers are selected. It is managed by a committee, having for its president the minister. Its officers are a secretary, treasurer, and superintendent, generally chosen annually by the teachers. The scholars, who, though mainly, are not exclusively composed of the working class, are mostly upwards of six years of age; but the tendency is now to establish infant classes for all between three and six. The proportion of *adults* in Sunday-schools considerably varies in different districts of the country; Wales and the manufacturing counties having very many upwards of 14 years, while London has but very few. Unfortunately, no inquiry was made at the census as to the *age* of Sunday scholars, so that we are still without complete intelligence on this important point. This difference of age in the scholars necessarily involves the

distribution of them into different classes, suited to their varying attainments: there is the *infant* class, as above referred to, for the children under six—the *ordinary* class for children between six and fourteen (divided into two or three sections, according to their ability to read)—and the *senior* class for young persons upwards of 14.—*Census*, 1851, pp. lxxi. lxxii.

The course of instruction is thus described:—

‘There are usually two school-attendances each Sunday, one in the morning, beginning about nine or half-past nine o’clock, and the other in the afternoon, commencing about two. On each occasion school is opened with devotional exercises, such as singing, reading of the Scriptures, and prayer. Next, the scholars who have committed tasks to memory repeat them. Then, the Bible lesson follows: portions of Scripture having been allotted to particular Sundays, scholars are expected to come prepared, by week-day study of the passage, for a catechetical examination by the teacher, who on his part ought to come prepared by similar study to impart the full meaning of the text, and to enforce its doctrines. . . . In the *senior* class the same plan is pursued as in the ordinary classes of children able to read; except that, of course, a superior ability of teaching is required. Indeed, an efficient instructor of a *senior* class has need, apparently, of information and capacity but little inferior to what is necessary for the regular ministry.’—*Ibid.* p. lxxii.

The age of a large proportion of Sunday-school scholars is, as might be supposed, very young.

‘The number of scholars under six years of age has been computed at about 400,000. The total number of children, of all ranks, between three and six, in England and Wales, may be stated at 1,338,890; and of those between three and *seven* at 1,765,420. The proportion of these belonging to the working classes would be about 1,004,168 and 1,324,065 respectively.’—*Ibid.* p. lxxv.

The various modes of teaching these infants are described; as, for instance, with movable letters on box-lids, shown from a gallery. The great desideratum, however, of Sunday-schools is felt, he says, by all to be the *senior* class, through which the influence of an earlier age may be continued. Much good is attributed to the mixture of young persons of the middle classes with the children of the poor, in the capacity of their Sunday-school teachers. Sick-clubs, festivals, lectures, excursions, all are made to hang from the Sunday-school; and the spiritual culture of the young, as well as the harmony of various orders of the whole people, are said to be promoted by them as ‘most necessary and effective instruments.’ The perfection, however, of the *senior* class seems to be still future:—

‘This is, indeed, made manifest by the returns of religious worship; for, unquestionably, most of the four or five millions who are constantly away from public worship must have passed through the Sunday school. It is, therefore, proposed to establish, in every school, a higher class for young persons upwards of 14, the course of instruction in which shall be of a more elaborate character than that of the general school. It is thought that, by throwing an air of dignity around the *senior* class, many may be attracted to attend it who would feel unwilling to be mingled with the children in the general school. But in proportion to the importance of these *senior* classes

is the difficulty of establishing and conducting them; a higher order of teachers being needful, whose superiority of intellect and information shall command the willing deference of the scholars, while their hearty sympathy with those they teach shall render the connexion rather one of friendship than of charity.'—*Census*, 1851, p. lxxv.

What the influence of Sunday-schools will be when this picture is fulfilled, we cannot pretend to say. The common exercise of the ministerial office need even now tremble before the power of this mighty agent, if Mr. Mann is to be credited:—

'The constant action on the minds of the youthful population, of more than a quarter of a million of religious teachers—not removed in general by age or sex from sympathy with their companions—each, too, having such a limited number of scholars as to make the influence direct and personal—must needs be working silently a great result. Intelligent familiarity with scriptural facts and doctrines must be gradually extending through the masses of society; and though, if tested merely by attendance on religious ordinances, much of this instruction may appear to be in vain, yet, doubtless, in a thousand other ways, though imperceptible, the influence exerted in the Sunday-school is more or less prolonged throughout the subsequent career, and mainly helps to bring about that increase of morality and deference to law, on which, from time to time, our public writers dwell with much complacency. Indeed, it may be very fairly questioned whether Sunday-school instructors do not exercise an influence, in moulding the religious mind of the community, considerably more extensive and more potent than proceeds from all the pulpits in the land.'—*Ibid.* p. lxxiii.

The clergy, then, had better at once sink their office, and become plain Sunday-school teachers, forgetting all their silken eloquence and their well-turned periods. Perhaps this were true, if the *pulpit* was all that had to be thought of in public worship.

Thus far we have only heard Mr. Mann's somewhat enthusiastic advocacy of Sunday-schools. Before we express any sentiments of our own, let us contrast his way of speaking with that of another responsible agent of Government. Mr. Kennedy, inspector for Lancashire, the chief county for Sunday-schools, thus writes:—

'I must no longer forbear to notice a cause which operates against the success of some schools in my district, towards the erection of which your Lordships have made large grants. My colleague, Mr. Birley, has, in his communications with me, noticed the same cause. I refer to the fact, that some promoters of school-buildings seem never to have really had at heart the success of the week-day school, but have been only in earnest, if we may judge from the facts and the results, about the Sunday-school. I feel that I should have no right to give this decided opinion, unless I were prepared to substantiate it. I will take, therefore, the case of St. John's Schools in Blackburn, towards the building of which your Lordships voted 800*l.* in 1844, and which I inspected for the first time this year. About these schools the present very intelligent and energetic incumbent, the Rev. H. J. Marlen, wrote to me as follows in April last:—"On my appointment to the benefice, eighteen months since, my attention was immediately

directed to the schools, which I found deplorably conducted.”—*Minutes*, p. 758.

After mentioning some local circumstances, he proceeds:—

‘The cause of the evil in this case I believe to be, that the last incumbent, the promoter of the building, thought the Sunday school—that pet object of rivalry in a Lancashire town—everything, and the daily school nothing, or next to nothing, in comparison. The very rooms in this case, with their fittings-up, were manifestly erected for the purposes of a Sunday school, and not of a week-day school.’—*Ibid.* p. 758.

The secret indignation of his mind is still further demonstrated in the somewhat rough handling of the following passage:—

‘The money for building is voted out of the public funds expressly for the purpose of a daily school, and to that purpose it should be honestly applied. It is not right, under such circumstances, to be hearty and energetic in all that affects the Sunday school, and to be fully satisfied with letting the daily school drag on a nominal and useless existence. I protest against that unwise spirit of the age,—happily, I believe, on the decline,—which would sacrifice the more humble and unattractive, but not less important, work of the daily school, to the éclat which in many parts attends a large Sunday school, with its occasional speechifying, and its smart array of neatly-dressed scholars, and of young lady teachers. The daily school is the place in which the young must be taught to understand and trained to appreciate the teaching of the Sunday school. Moreover, no reasonable man can doubt, I think, but that the teaching and training of five days in a week may be made, with due pains, more valuable, even in a strictly religious point of view, than of any one day in a week.’—*Ibid.* p. 759.

On one point, however, both these gentlemen seem to meet; and this coincidence is the more to be remarked from the concurrent testimony of others, also in the same direction. One of the suggestions made by the Committee of Convocation, in their report read by the Bishop of London last July, was, that there should be services in our churches specially adapted for children. Let us see, in the first place, what Mr. Mann says on the subject of this supposed want. In the passage we are about to quote, the peculiar view of Sunday-schools, which is practically adopted by Dissenters, comes out most evidently to be Mr. Mann’s own idea of these institutions. The Dissenting Sunday-school, especially in the afternoon, is not a collecting of children together for the purpose of taking them to public worship; it is not an accessory to the chapel, but a substitute. The passage is as follows:—

‘It is, doubtless, much to be desired that more attention should be paid by the higher classes of the Church to the working of what now has every appearance of a permanent institution; for no expectation, probably, can be indulged that the natural instructors of their children in religious knowledge (*viz.* parents) will be ever generally able and disposed to undertake and prosecute this duty; and it seems to be quite clear that the ordinary services of church and chapel are entirely inappropriate and unproductive to the juvenile community.’—*Census*, 1851, p. lxxiv.

We say, that incidentally this passage throws light on all the enthusiasm of Mr. Mann, in praise of the elaborate organization which he describes. He, like the Dissenters, does not look on this system as a feeder to the Church or Chapel, but as a substitute for it. To a certain extent we accept the hint suggested. Let us, however, in the next place, hear what Mr. Kennedy says on the same topic. The passage is so full of clearly stated facts and sentiments, that we are unable to curtail it.

‘ Now there is an important impediment in the way of due religious instruction, and to the due appreciation of religious services by the scholars in your National schools, which I desire to notice on this occasion. It is, that the Sunday’s services are rendered irksome, and are in some degree meaningless to them. The day-scholars are usually assembled between 9 and 10 A.M. in the school-room; then follows generally a certain amount of teaching, after which they are led to church. This is all right; but unfortunately our services are decidedly too long for children under any circumstances; and this undue length of the services is greatly aggravated by the fact, that the children are too often stationed in some part of the church which is neither adapted to comfort nor to hearing. To all this must be added the fact, that the sermons are never addressed or adapted to them, and are, in sober truth, wholly unintelligible and uninteresting to them. Thus the religious services of the Sunday, which ought to be profitable and delightful to the children, are perverted into an object of distaste, if not of aversion. It was confessed to me by a zealous and indefatigable Sunday-school teacher, that it was often a difficult matter to prevent the boys from running away on the road from school to church. Here is a real and serious evil. One mode of counteracting it which has occurred to me is, that in towns we should have special services on Sunday, if possible in special chapels, for our National school children. The length of the whole service should be adapted to them; and the matter of the discourse should be suited to their circumstances as children, as well as to their capacity. This would make our observances on the Lord’s day a living reality to the youthful poor, instead of its being, as it is at present, something which I do not like to characterise.’—*Minutes*, p. 762.

It is to be observed, that the writer of this passage is introduced to the subject, not by anything connected with Sunday-schools, but by the feeling of some deficiency in the religious training of day-scholars under his inspection. The labours of the week require that a proper use of the Sunday shall be added to them, or the religious element of the whole wants its stimulus and completion. Can then no practical lesson be taken from all their concurrent testimony. We have brought certain formal witnesses to state their opinions that a great mistake is made, every Sunday, in the treatment of the children of the poor, by the Church of England. Besides, however, the testimony of Convocation, of Inspectors, and of Registrars, we appeal to the weekly experience of almost every Churchman. Some are reminded of the fact in one way, and some in another. Some contemplate the Sunday-school during its attendance at Church with feelings of compassion, and others with those of irritation.

In either case the facts are the same, and are too well-known to need repetition. The attention or devotion of Sunday-school children, are things hardly thought of; they are only to be kept as quiet as possible, thrust into a corner, made to sit through the prayers, because kneeling gives opportunity for talking, and superintended by persons, who, in the very discharge of their duties, are compelled to be examples of the total neglect of all proper and reverential behaviour in Church. Exceptions there are to these statements, but we feel confident of their general accuracy. Perhaps in some Churches they may not be thrust into a corner, where they can quietly *play* for two hours, provided they are not too noisy,—they may even be in the centre of the Church or in the chancel; but if this is the case, they form a perpetual interruption to the devotional quiet of the whole congregation, unless, indeed, they are very highly trained under a system that is able to maintain the youthful mind in a state of awe and reverence for a great length of time. Where this is effected, some better results may be experienced; but, even here, we doubt the ultimate good of what must be an unnatural tension. The feeling of reverence ought to be associated in children with what is pleasant, and kind and good, not with a slavish awe, or with any lasting prostration of animal spirits. And in estimating Sunday-schools, the peculiar trials to which their management exposes the youthful teachers are often forgotten. Without the most careful watching, to elevate ‘a young lady or gentleman’ of the age of fifteen or sixteen into the perilous office of a religious instructor—to get them to take a class and be saluted as teacher—is productive of the greatest danger. Among Dissenters the Sunday-school teachers are a recognised class in the community, and a very useful one for proselyting purposes: but it is a class of young people of especially disagreeable and dangerous habits, flippant and irreverent in tone, and whose habit of constant association leads to gossiping and rivalry in dress as well as to other dangerous habits.

The question then would seem to occur, and does occur to many: Are Sunday-schools, after all, good and useful institutions? Called on to answer this question, with reference to Mr. Mann’s report of them, we feel this difficulty to start with, that we are invited to judge of the good or evil done by Dissent;—for these schools, as he developes them, are undoubtedly the offspring of Dissenting bodies, and inconsistent with the practical arrangements of the Church, as at present existing, and certainly with the work of training up children to be attendants at Church, or professing Churchmen. As far then as it is a question between Church and Dissent, we must let it alone, for we are wholly incompetent to decide whether it is best for the children of Dis-

senters to be at the schools or meeting-houses of their respective bodies; or even if we decided for the former, it would not be as impartial judges of the intrinsic merits of the latter. As regards then the Church, how are we to answer the still pending question of the usefulness of Sunday-schools? To say that because they do not fulfil their purpose of producing future Church-goers, we should be better without them, would be simply to turn the children adrift on the care of their parents, which we know would lead, in very many instances, to their entire estrangement from all religion. To condemn Sunday-schools wholesale, is to condemn one great means by which a large portion of the Christian community are alone able to fulfil that work of mercy, which consists in teaching the ignorant. It is so obvious a good work to collect together those persons who form Sunday-school teachers, and give them the opportunity of voluntarily instructing or reading with their poor neighbours' children, that if little good seems to spring from it in that particular way which we had anticipated, we must accuse some details in the management of it, and not the great work of charity itself. It is a most wholesome Christian duty for those who have been instructed themselves, to impart instruction to children whose parents are unable to do it; and Sunday is an unexceptional day for the exercise of this work of love; it is also the only day which the labours of the week leave available for this purpose, to the great mass of volunteer teachers. In these two facts, we have indisputable arguments for Sunday-schools, which nothing can controvert. It is also a powerful testimony to any existing agency for this object, that it is found, when efficiently carried out, to produce certain moral and social advantages, and a certain amount of good feeling between different classes, in the way described by Mr. Mann. The 'smart array of neatly dressed scholars and young lady teachers,' are, in their proper place, very agreeable exchanges for abject and neglected dirt. One duty, however, or one religious observance, must not be made to supplant another, but work in harmony with it. The Dissenting Sunday-school aims at supplanting the use of God's house as far as regards children; while those of the Church are made an addition to it, though we fear not adjusted with perfect harmony. Both school and Church seem to suffer by a sort of mutual injury; but what suffers more than all, is the cheerful day of rest, which the child ought to enjoy, and look forward to all the week, as the bright spot of time's dull passage. Cannot all these be made to harmonise? Perhaps the united force of all, each adding strength to the other, might produce as happy results as those described by Mr. Mann; results which would also last somewhat longer, and merge into the mature duties of a Chris-

tian life, as by a natural process of unchecked growth. In the first place, what is it that children require, in each of these three departments, in order to produce on their minds and souls a proper result? We should say that one unbroken hour's good religious instruction (for which preparation had been made in the week) would be sufficient, and as much as could be enforced with any advantage. If teachers really know what they have to do, and punctually attend to the work, they may easily get through a great deal of instruction or reading in this hour, and gain perhaps as favourable an influence over their pupils, as by fatiguing them, on their day of rest, for more than double that time. If it be replied that one hour will give no time for that kind of instruction which is meant to be a substitute for the day-school, we reply that a Sunday-school cannot, and ought not, to be one of common secular instruction, and that the attempt to make it such, is robbing God of His one day, because Mammon will not spare time out of his six.

If one hour would suffice for school, the same time would also be as much as could be required of their devotional powers within the sacred walls of the Church. This would be divided into morning and evening service, with perhaps another quarter of an hour, at one or other of these occasions, for a plain catechetical address, to be the fulfilment of our Church's intention where she orders, in the rubric, that the young people shall be catechised after the second lesson, and in the canons, before evening service. Two hours and a half is thus all that seems to be required from the whole of Sunday, which leaves ample scope for such recreation and pleasure as parents may be able to supply. If it be said, that one object of a Sunday-school is to keep children out of harm's way for as long a time on the Sunday as possible; and that the present arrangement is good, because it detains them, from about nine o'clock to half-past four, with only a short interval for dinner, under religious influence suitable to the character of the day; we reply at once that here another element is introduced into the question, which we wholly ignore, viz., that we have to enforce a puritanical severity on children in their observance of the day. If, under some peculiar circumstances, it is necessary to detain children from their homes as much as possible on that day, knowing that moral contamination there awaits them; in that case, let the managers of Sunday-schools recognise the fact, that in addition to the work of teachers, they are taking on themselves the duties of guardians for the time being, and, therefore, should treat them accordingly, and provide for the children, during the time that they keep them, over and above the usual hours of instruction or devotion.

Having now allotted to each of the three Sunday occupations, viz. : instruction, devotion, and recreation, its due share; how best can we make these harmonise with each other in the arrangements of the day? A few months ago it would have seemed utopian, not to say unconstitutional and seditious, to make any suggestions, which would imply that Sunday-school children need not be kept in church for two hours and a half in a morning, and one hour and a half in the afternoon; but since the wise and considerate suggestion of the Committee of Convocation, that there should be short services for children, we see the way much more clear before us; and the Act of Uniformity, which before stood up like a tall ridge of snowy mountains to oppose any progress, at once assumes a less impenetrable, and a less ice-bound appearance.

The details of such arrangements must, of course, depend on local circumstances and the staff of clergy. If the service for children is a special one, it would probably take place at nine o'clock or a little after, and be followed by the hour's schooling. In other places, where extra services were not convenient, the school might assemble at such a time as would allow the hour's work before morning service, suffering the schools to leave church after the third collect under some orderly superintendence. In the afternoon we would almost dispense with teaching in the school, but, in preference, would have the clergy catechise the elder and better prepared classes in the church (in company with any other young persons who would come), interspersing with his questions such words of address, as might form a practical sermon, more serviceable for schools than the two pulpit discourses, which at present are thought to be attended with so little advantage to them. A regular service would, of course, be connected with this, according to such arrangements as might best suit other suggestions now before Convocation; and where the afternoon service was continued in the present manner, there being no special one for children, they would leave before the commencement of the sermon, having already been addressed themselves. Thus their school and church day would end, not we hope—if the Church services had been spirited, and made cheerful by Christian music, in which they themselves take an active part—with that sense of dulness, which now seems, by concurrent testimony, to drive them away from Church, as soon as they are released from the obligations of school.

Children's services, of the kind we imagine the Committee of Convocation to refer to, would require the Church to be more at their disposal, than any continuance of the exclusive pew system would allow. They must have thoroughly good parts of the Church for their use, in order that they may form a con-

nected body with all the feeling of the Church being their own, for the time being. The whole principle, indeed, of special services, now we presume under consideration, must assume, for its basis, the general idea of Churches being always open and available for various congregations, at different services and offices of religion going on throughout the whole day. Again, the teachers of Church Sunday-schools ought to understand, that the main object of their work is to bring up those, whom they instruct, in the habits of prayer and worship to God. Their work then is incomplete, if they leave the children after a certain amount only of *instruction*. They ought to take their own classes to Church, and be examples to them of devout and reverential conduct. Under the present system this is a much to expect of them, but if the attendance of children were of shorter duration, and were their comforts more considered, in having better places and more fit appliances of devotion allotted, we cannot but think that teachers would easily fall into the system. The great objection now is, that they cannot listen to the sermon, if they sit with the schools; but if the children themselves were not present at the sermon, this at once reduces to the ground.

In concluding this subject, we would express a hope, that any special services for schools will be open also to all other children, and, indeed, to anyone who wished to enter the Church. We cannot but think that parents of all classes would avail themselves of these opportunities, of bringing their children to short and more appropriate services than at present exist; also, that old people and others, who feel their need of catechetical instruction, would attend, when such offices were going on.

We cannot bring these statistics and remarks on education to a close, without some few comments on the present source of such energy as at present exists, and the light which may thereby be thrown on the measures that seem necessary, if we anticipate that the cause will progress for the future. The Inspectors of Schools all lament the indifference of real monied interest to the cause of education, and the difficulty of supporting schools from any voluntary contributions, that do not press with most unequal weight on the clergy. It is well known that the clergy are not a rich class, and that the property of the Church is becoming every day more secularised by the purchase of livings, and yet the burden of schools is suffered, in many places, almost wholly to fall on the parochial clergy.

There has been a great agitation lately on the subject of schools, and a stimulus has been given to the clergy, who, in many cases, under the immediate pressure of the urgent requirement of a parish, have established schools, without really

counting the cost of maintaining them in a state of efficiency. An unequal system of voluntary taxation such as this cannot, however, last, and is not a basis on which we can expect that the cause will flourish. Let us, however, on this subject, refer to Mr. Douglas Tinling's report:—

‘The present expense of these schools, inefficient as many of them are, falls so heavily on the parochial clergy, that they are unable to venture more largely without some additional local sympathy, or some exterior aid. I have been told by the clergy that the school costs them annually a sum varying from 10*l.* to 25*l.*, and that as they do not feel justified in risking a larger annual expenditure, they are therefore obliged to continue a system of school instruction which they are fully aware is insufficient and unsatisfactory.

‘In speaking of the sum of 10*l.* to 25*l.*, I am referring only to the smaller schools: in many instances the expense of the parish schools falls far more heavily on the clergy; e.g., one clergyman in his published statement shows, on a greatly reduced scale of expenditure, the deficiency of 123*l.* 13*s.* in his annual income for his parish schools, which deficiency, when exceeding this amount, he for seven years cheerfully provided for. These schools for the most part depend upon the local funds, which are inadequate, being drawn almost entirely from the clergy, with the addition of a few very small subscriptions, and for this reason inefficient teachers are allowed to hold their places, and the school-room remains unfit for the teaching and training of the children of the poor.’—*Minutes*, p. 562.

If education then is to progress, it seems to follow from these facts, that a stimulus is necessary to the owners of property, to make them supply the funds. It is most injurious to the services of the Church, as well as to the poor of a parish, that a clergyman should have continually pressing on him a heavy charge for the school. What he has to spare from his income, he would often wish to employ in some little church or parochial arrangements, which his own special interest in the parish may suggest; or in direct relief to the poor, according to his own irresponsible choice of objects.

It is, indeed, a question whether, as a matter of pecuniary justice and right, property should not, in some form or other, be made to provide education for the poor. Wages, in agricultural districts, are calculated without any reference to the expense of education, and all agree that parochial schools cannot be self-supporting. If, therefore, the property of a parish is not forced, by local taxation, or its contribution to the consolidated fund, to provide schools, we fear that they will not exist. Education is a national requirement, and, therefore, he who neglects to educate his child is injurious to the community, as he is who will not vaccinate his child. Surely then means ought to be provided by which he can fulfil this obligation? The expense of vaccination is borne by local rates, and we do not see, so far as the ground we have mentioned is concerned,

why schools, for those children who naturally fall on public funds for anything beyond food and clothing, should not be likewise supported by compulsory taxation. But, in deciding such a question as this, other considerations must be taken into account, besides that of pecuniary justice. The known tendency of State authority, local or central, to claim its *quid pro quo* for its pecuniary support, and control the use of the means which it supplies, suggests great danger to the Church from such an arrangement.

NOTICES.

ARCHDEACON CHURTON has bestowed great pains and care on another metrical translation of the Psalms. It is published, in commemoration of the excellent writer's Archdeaconry, under the title of 'The Cleveland Psalter,' (J. H. Parker.) Exhibiting great research, and a conscientious comparison of versions and commentaries, as well as a considerable command of poetical diction, if we say that the writer has succeeded as well as most, or even all, of his predecessors, we shall not, in our own estimation, award a very high praise. We believe that in this volume many of the Psalms are metrized as well as they can be: but after all we conclude, as in Mr. Keble's well-known judgment, that the thing is simply impossible. The genius of Eastern poetry is totally irreconcilable with the Western forms; and while we are free to admit, that graceful and useful poetical and religious exercises may be produced under the form of a metrical Psalter, they do not in any sense reproduce the Book of Psalms. For example: Archdeacon Churton has sought the widest variety in his metres. Does the Hebrew poetry contain in its various forms—for we are free to admit that it has syllabic varieties in length of the lines—anything equivalent to the palpable changes from the iambic to the dactylic and trochaic metres which we find in the present Version, as in many of its predecessors? However, we will let the 'Cleveland Psalter' commend itself, as, indeed, it deserves to do, to such of our readers, and we believe they are many, who do not share in our own dislike to all metrical Psalms. Here is the beginning of Psalm cxix.—one in our judgment eminently unsuitable to the four-line stanza; inasmuch as this particular Psalm is condensed, gnomic and terse in form, therein resembling the Proverbs. Whether its close moral tension and sharply-cut utterances are not, from the nature of the case, diluted and slackened in any stanza, we leave to the judgment of critics:—

'Ps. cxix.

'There is a way, where blessing meets
The pilgrim journeying on:
The saint, whose life was undefil'd,
In that blest way had gone.

'There is a law, whose rules of truth
The wand'ring soul reclaim;
And blest are they, whose heart adores
The God from Whom it came.

'No love misplac'd beguiles their souls
With fraud and wrong to stray:
They walk with innocence secure
In His all-perfect way.'

We do not say that the following, whose form is suggested by 'a familiar Children's hymn, Ere I sleep,' is not a graceful poem : but is it anything like David's Psalm !

'Ps. cxxxi.

- '1. Lord, my heart is with the lowly ;
I do seek,
With the meek,
Humble thoughts and holy.
- 'Let me not by vain aspiring
Strive to rise,
But be wise,
Safer truth desiring.'
- '2. Pride that soars must fall in sadness ;
Lowliness
God doth bless
With an infant's gladness ;
- 'When it lies all weak from weaning,
Yet at rest
On the breast
In its gladness leaning.
- '3. Nought my mind from God shall sever :
Israel, thou
Pay this vow
To thy King for ever.'

We submit the 'Cleveland Psalter' to a crucial experiment, in selecting from it two Psalms, on which, and very properly, Archdeacon Churton has bestowed all his skill.

'Ps. xxiii.

- '1. My shepherd is the gracious Lord,
Amidst His flock I feed :
While I am His, and He is mine,
I cannot suffer need.
- '2. He leads me, when on Judah's hills
The pastures spring and blow,
And welling from the eternal fount
Glad streams of comfort flow.
- '3. He gives my troubled spirit rest,
Restor'd from sin and shame,
To paths of righteousness and peace,
For His most holy Name.
- '4. Yea, though I walk in dreary vale
Of death's o'ercovering shade,
No evil will I fear, whilst Thou
Art near to bring me aid :

'Thy rod and staff sustain my soul
To tread the dangerous way ;
Thy rod, in love to chasten me,
Thy staff, to be my stay.

'5. Before the foes who will my harm
My table Thou hast spread,
With wine hast crown'd my cup, and pour'd
Sweet odours on my head.

'6. Thy mercy and Thy goodness, Lord,
My help through life shall be,
Till in Thy house I find a home
For evermore with Thee.'

While some verses are close translation, verse 4 of the above psalm is plainly mere paraphrase and comment.

' Ps. c.

'1. Let all the peopled earth
To God their voices raise ;
All tribes of mortal birth,
With gladness tell his praise ;
To Him alone
Your offerings bring,
Rejoice and sing
Before His throne.

'2. O turn, your God to own,
The Lord, by Whom ye live ;
Not man, but God alone
The gift of life could give :
Beneath His care
We feel no need,
Like flocks we feed
In pastures fair.

'3. O hasten to His gates,
Where saints with praises meet ;
The courts, where blessing waits
The living Lord to greet :
Your thanks proclaim,
And tell aloud,
How good is God,
How great His name !

'4. For O, the Lord is good ;
His mercy, as of yore,
Ere Ocean heav'd its flood,
Stands firm for evermore :
His truth shall reign
With lasting peace,
When time shall cease
To wax and wane.'

Mr. Gibson, of Furneux Pelham, has printed, under the title of 'Testimony of the Church to Holy Baptism,' (Bell,) a very complete catena of authorities, patristic, ritual, and reformed, on the subject. The passages we observe are translated, and the work is creditable both to the scholarship and churchmanship of the writer. It brings together, into an available compass, what has hitherto been found in detached and often inaccessible quarters.

'Hungarian Sketches' is the first instalment of a series, to be called 'Constable's Miscellany of Foreign Literature.' The general plan promises well: it offers a set of translations, chiefly, as we imagine, of popular and contemporaneous works, in which fiction will predominate. The first volume, some novelets by Moritz Jókai, introduces us to a new class of manners and character. In the latter respect, the writer is far inferior to Miss Bremer; but in mere power of external description, he somewhat resembles her. Hungarian country life, with its rough, rude, barbarous plenty, is a curious thing; and the uncommon quantity which the heroes eat and drink, causes us perpetual astonishment in reading this volume. It is absolutely cloying and surfeiting in the kitchen and cellar department. We have observed this peculiarity in inferior artists; a novel writer and a painter, when he can do nothing else, attracts universal attention, or perhaps sympathy, when his page, or his canvass, displays something to eat. Mr. Jókai is never so happy as when he has got all his dramatic company fairly at the dinner-table.

In his 'History of Scotland,' (Masters,) Mr. Flower has printed a useful little book, and one which carries on a favourite series, the 'Juvenile Englishman's Library.' Why thrice, at p. 231, Lord Balmerino is miscalled Bolderino we cannot conjecture.

We are very much afraid that Mr. Spry, of West Bromwich, hardly reaches that class of poets which neither gods, nor men, nor columns can endure. This gentleman, with the best possible intentions, prints certain words divided into decasyllabic masses, which the kind-hearted may take for blank verse—very blank verse indeed. Mr. Spry's subject is 'The Deluge,' (Birmingham: Langbridge.) Here is a specimen:—

Yet seven days, an awful interval
By God's forbearance, for repentance given,
Ere his just work of punishment begins.
His mercy men despised, his power defied,
And God, in anger, bared his holy arm,
To vindicate his justice and his truth,
And sweep them like the chaff from off the earth.

Mr. Anderdon, in mentioning whose name we are betraying no confidence, has published in a handsome form a second edition of his delightful 'Life of Bishop Ken,' (Murray,) of which we have long since spoken our sincere admiration.

'The Plain Commentary,' (J. H. Parker,) that most practical series of all practical Bible notes, has proceeded to two more parts, embracing St. Luke. A greater encomium we cannot pass than to say that it equals its predecessors.

Archbishop Whately, in his recent Charge, 'Thoughts on Christian Moral Instruction,' (J. W. Parker,) speaking of some of our comments on the disquisitions of himself and his friend, Bishop Copleston, says, 'that the Reviewer,'—meaning ourselves,—'probably was writing for such as he 'trusted had never read, nor were likely to read, any of the works in which 'these warnings had been put forth,' viz. Archbishop Whately's own works. Now, we must say this is very unfair in the Archbishop; he returns evil for good. Far from trusting that our readers will not read Archbishop Whately, we have generally been at the trouble of advertising all his works for nothing. We have always made a point of counting up the number of times Archbishop Whately quotes himself. And, save Archbishop Whately himself, we know nobody who has called such attention to Archbishop Whately's writings as ourselves. Certainly, we cannot say whether our readers are likely to read these works or not: but it is undeniable that we have taken explicit pains to proclaim their existence. Here they are once more, in the order in which they are known and quoted, bristling in look, polemic in sound, angry and defiant in gesture: the labours, as Archbishop Whately tells us, 'of a quarter of a century, earnestly and repeatedly setting forth a truth.' Only it is always in the shape of Whately's 'Peculiarities,' 'Difficulties,' 'Dangers,' 'Errors,' 'Abuses,' and 'Doubts'—which is not a little characteristic.

There is a simplicity and kindliness in Archdeacon Berens' 'Sermons for a Sick Room,' (Rivingtons,) which makes them a superior specimen of the good old-fashioned school of divinity. We always welcome the writings of this good man.

'Scenery, Science, and Art,' is a miscellaneous volume, by Professor Ansted, the geologist. It is published by Van Voorst, and is unequal in execution: it has a fragmentary and unconnected aspect. Nor are we quite satisfied with the mixture of criticisms on the picturesque and scientific details. On art, Mr. Ansted is common-place: science, and especially geology, is his strongest point.

Mr. Daniel Butler, of St. John's Wood, has preached and printed a 'Funeral Sermon,' for his colleague, Mr. Wharton, (J. W. Parker,) which is not only a graceful composition, but exhibits great skill and judgment in the writer. It commemorates just a respectable common-place character: and to do this, and to say everything that ought to be said, without fulsome-ness or exaggeration, is no easy task. Mr. Butler has achieved it.

The theological book of the quarter—and it is that least prolific in new publications—is a volume of 'Academical Discourses,'—the Irish Bampton Lecture—on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, by Mr. W. Lee, Fellow of Trinity College, (Rivingtons.) Mr. Lee pursues the subject beyond the ordinary details; and with reference 'to the nature of Inspiration itself, and 'to the possibility of reconciling the unquestionable stamp of humanity 'impressed upon every page of the Bible, with that undeviating belief in its 'lawfulness and infallibility, which is the Christian's most precious inheritance,' he endeavours to supply a blank in English theology. With the same object, he distinguishes between Revelation and Inspiration; and especially combats the views of S. T. Coleridge and Mr. Morell.

Few laymen have worked more steadily and more practically than Mr. Henry Hoare, in the cause of the restoration of Synodal action. He has, therefore, especial claims to be heard, in detailing the progress of the cause. We have before us a 'Report of the Proceedings at a Meeting at Chichester,' (Rivingtons,) in which Mr. Hoare took part; and though we are disposed to think that he not unnaturally perhaps attributes more of the success of the cause to his own immediate friends than to other workers, it is quite certain that he does not say enough of his own personal exertions and sacrifices.

Mr. Strachey, in his 'Miracles and Science,' (Longmans,) has got out of his depth.

The Rev. Nash Stapleton publishes 'Three Broad Sheets analytical of the Church Catechism,' (Groombridge:) this analysis proves that Mr. Stapleton himself is in serious need of instruction in the document which he undertakes to explain.

We welcome in the seventh volume of 'The Monthly Packet,' (Mozley,) the most complete, and varied, and lively periodical of a serious cast which reaches us.

'The Violet's Close; or, Annie Dale,' (Hatchards,) contains some truths; *ex. grat.* p. 56: 'It is wonderful to think of time, and how it passes. To reflect that each minute as it glides has gone for ever! That all the wealth which every land could produce, could not bring a single second back!'

A letter, which certainly requires an answer, has been written to Mr. Dale, of S. Pancras, by one of the district incumbents, Mr. Millner, of Kentish Town, (Darling.) Its title is, 'Parochial Division, the only remedy for the Spiritual Wants of St. Pancras.' Its substance is a tolerably explicit charge that the Vicar's scheme of dividing the parish is to get rid of all the work, and to retain all the pay.

'Readings for the Aged,' (Masters,) is the second part of an ingenious and useful attempt on the part of Mr. Neale to found some sort of instruction to a small congregation of old and sick people under his care, on the minor Church festivals. They exhibit all the writer's rare facility of illustration and language, clear, popular, and not vulgar.

We cannot testify our delight with the 'Narrative of the Bishop of Newfoundland's Second Voyage to Labrador,' performed last year, so practically as by giving a specimen of it:—

'Friday, August 12th.—We removed to-day to Ward's Harbour, (thirty-five miles,) with a very light breeze, sailing at five o'clock, and coming again to anchor at three o'clock in the afternoon.

'Mr. Kingwell followed in his boat, (this place, with all the Bay to the north of Twillingate being in his Mission,) but could not leave before ten o'clock, and was twelve hours making the journey.

'Mr. Boone went on shore, and found the principal planter, through whose exertions chiefly the little church (a very humble but neatly finished structure) was built, prepared to receive and welcome us. He showed his church with modest satisfaction, which, though only a wooden

'room, twenty-four feet by eighteen, with five square windows, has cost him some seventy pounds, besides labour; as great a sacrifice or expenditure perhaps for him, as the whole cost of a cathedral would be to some "that have riches." He was very desirous to have the building consecrated, and with it the land adjacent, which he and his neighbours had marked out for a grave-yard. I felt little or no difficulty about the church, but could not consent to consecrate the grave-yard while it had no fence. He met that difficulty by engaging to put up a temporary fence of stakes and nets to-morrow, and a more substantial one of rails and pickets before the winter. Feeling sure that his promise, God willing, would be performed, I did not hesitate to grant all his request. He spoke to me with much deep and right feeling of a neighbour who had been his chief associate and assistant in planning and building their church, and whom, after watching over and tending in a long illness, as the physician of both body and soul, he had lately consigned to his last resting-place, in the grave-yard of their own choice. "He had been wild," he said, "in his younger days, but for three years he had been an altered character, and before his death he told me all he had done wrong." The poor man, it seems, had recognised the duty, if not the privilege, of the Apostle's injunction, "Confess your faults one to another;" and that other duty and privilege had not been forgotten by his friend, "to pray one for another." We walked together to some of the lovely harbours or "Arms," as they are called, and I was pleased to observe several large patches of land under cultivation, with promising crops of potatoes, &c. I derived much gratification, and I hope some instruction, from my walk.

'*Saturday, August 13th.*—While Mr. Kingwell was employed preparing his candidates for Confirmation, and Mr. Freer in measuring and laying down the church, grave-yard, and small portion of land for a glebe, I journeyed with Mr. Boone in a boat to a neighbouring settlement, called Nimrod Tickle (nine miles). We left at half-past eight, and did not reach our destination till two o'clock. We visited all the families, six or seven, all happily members of the Church, and remarkably clean and tidy in their dwellings, &c. Our stay was unfortunately very short, and it was well we did not remain longer, as we were four hours in returning. We, however, arrived in time to visit the church and grave-yard, and inspect the preparations made for to-morrow's holy services. We found the fence of nets and stakes duly set up. My lectern was carried into the church, to supply both reading-desk and pulpit. A better table also had been placed at the east end, and a stand erected for the "font-basin," that at least, in outward things, the Apostle's injunction might be observed, and all things be done decently and in order.

'*12th Sunday after Trinity, August 14th.*—The little wooden building was duly consecrated and dedicated to the honour of God, and his worship and service only, by the name of Christ's Church—and, I trust and believe, with all due devotion and readiness of mind, if not with all the formality and circumstance of such services, in more favoured or more wealthy localities. A Missionary Bishop, with two Priests and a Deacon, and a few simple-minded and devout fishermen, were perhaps as suitable in setting apart this simple wooden structure, in a remote harbour of Newfoundland, as the more splendid processions of our native country, to

testify their zeal of God's House, and of His holy name. The administration of the Lord's Supper followed, as I suppose it always does if possible, the consecration of the house, if it does not rather form a part of the service. I was thankful to observe the worthy promoter of the church, with all the members of his family who had attained to a proper age (six or seven in number), devoutly attending and partaking together of this heavenly feast.

In the afternoon the same parties were all confirmed, as I make no scruple of admitting those persons to the Holy Communion in the morning, who are about to be confirmed in the afternoon, according to the permission of the Rubric, in reference to those who "are ready and desirous to be confirmed." Grandparents and parents with their children took upon themselves, (I hope and believe devoutly and intelligently,) and in the presence of the congregation, those vows and promises which they knew to have been binding upon them, and by which they had been bound in their hearts and lives long before. Two children were baptized after the second Lesson; and at the conclusion of the service and sermon, the petition for the Consecration having been read in the church, the grave-yard was consecrated, the people walking the bounds, and repeating the Psalms with myself and the other Clergy. The day was warm and bright, and the air clear and calm, and Ward's Harbour was blessed in a Sabbath with God's richest mercies of nature and grace. I invited the worthy planter, with all his family and connexions in the neighbourhood, on board the Church Ship in the evening, to practise Psalmody, in which they take much delight, and are very desirous to improve; and they thankfully availed themselves, men and women, of the opportunity; and I entirely believe we complied with the Apostolic precept, both speaking to ourselves and to each other in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, and singing and making melody in our hearts to the Lord.

They all agreed it was "the beautifullest house" and "beautifullest church" they had ever seen.

Monday, August 15th.—We were favoured with a fair but light wind, and reached Nipper's Harbour before twelve o'clock. The title or name is rather an alarming one, particularly to thin-skinned Southerners, as the Nipper is the largest and most formidable of the mosquitoes; and it might be supposed that the Harbour obtained its affix, or distinguishing title, from the number of these tormentors. Probably, in former times, the Harbour was full of wood; but as the wood has diminished till almost none remains, (as is unhappily the case in nearly every inhabited Harbour,) the flies have become less numerous and troublesome; and they are everywhere fewer than usual this summer. The shore or outward face of the rocks, on this side of the Bay, is most barren and forbidding—not less so than Labrador; but concealed behind or within this iron-work are beautiful coves and bights, well wooded, and with abundance of wild grass and other vegetation, and, where there are inhabitants, potatoes and other garden produce. Mr. Kingwell, who followed us in his boat, arrived soon enough to accompany Mr. Boone, and to visit the people on shore, and invite them to our Evening Service on board. There are several planters here of apparently considerable opulence and respect-

'tability, living in decent houses, and with many comforts. One of the 'principals is an Englishman, but resident here thirty-three years. His com- 'forts may be in some degree due to four noble-looking sons, the youngest 'nineteen, all unmarried, and living and working at home. At the Even- 'ing Service, all these four were confirmed on board, with a few others. 'There were several more candidates, but they were deficient in know- 'ledge, and Mr. Kingwell had not been able to give them the neces- 'sary instructions. Those presented, were selected as well prepared and 'seriously disposed. Our cabin was filled with a most respectable and 'attentive congregation. I exhorted them, among other things, to proceed 'with their Church, which, though but a wooden structure like the rest, 'has been many years in progress, or rather not in progress, but standing 'still, and not so much for want either of ability or desire on the part of 'the people to finish it, as for want of some person to direct and order 'them. Could the Missionary remain but a fortnight in the place, to 'assign their parts and overlook and encourage them, he might see the 'good work completed, without his labour or other assistance, by the 'people themselves.

'It is obvious, however, that by a knowledge of joiner's and carpenter's 'work, he might materially assist as well as encourage; and I think 'it of importance that instruction in such matters should be given, 'in due place and proportion, at St. Augustine's and other Missionary 'Colleges. It is of far more importance, however, even in these works 'purely mechanical, that Clergymen should know how to direct and employ 'the mind and will of the people. The presiding mind is more necessary 'than the helping hand; and there is, of course, some danger of a Clergy- 'man losing his proper place and influence, in descending to manual 'labour and cooperation.

'In this Harbour, however, twenty stout and handy men would, I be- 'lieve, be found, needing no help or direction beyond exhortation and 'admonition; and a decent church might be completed in a fortnight. 'I was truly grieved that my stay must necessarily be so short; and I did 'what lay in my power to know and be known by the principal people, by 'receiving and conversing with them in my own cabin after the service.

All our readers will welcome a new series of 'Synodalia,' chiefly con- 'fined to documents, under the title of 'The Journal of Convocation,' (Rivingtons,) and the tried and valued editorship of Mr. Warren. How 'suggestive is the title!

A flight of Visitation and Commemoration Sermons, 'thick as autumnal leaves,' has reached us. Among them we may specify, 1. Mr. Lowe's, of Hurstperpoint, 'The Lord and Giver of Life,' (Masters.)—2. 'Ministerial Watchfulness,' by Mr. Cochin, of Birmingham, (Hatchard.)—3. 'The Presence of Christ in Holy Places, by Mr. Courtenay, (Masters.)—4. Mr. H. Seymour's, on 'Good Works at Bishop of Worcester's Visitation,' (Rivingtons.)—5. Mr. Cunningham's 'Ordination Sermon,' at Farnham Castle, (Hatchards.)—6. 'The Wisdom of Bezaleel,' by Mr. Baines, (Skef- 'fington.)

INDEX TO VOL. XXVIII.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

B.

Bunsen, Philosophy of Language, 448—460. Etruscan language, 448. Are the Etruscans an indigenous race? 449. Müller, Betham, 450. Mrs. H. Gray, 451. Bunsen, 452, 453. Leibnitz, 454. Humboldt, 455. Bunsen on Etruscan language, 456. A mixed language, 459.

C.

Census, &c. [*Census of Great Britain*, 1851. *Education, &c. &c.*] 461—501. Interest of the subject, 461. Results, 462. History of popular education. Raikes, Lancaster, Bell, National Society, &c. 463—465. Proportion of scholars to children, 466, 467. Quality of instruction, 468. Remuneration, 469. Training colleges, 470. Deficiency of education, 471. Centralization, 474. Grammar schools, 475—478. Church Education, 479—485. Employment of children, 486. Half-time schools, 488. Literary Institutions, 489. Sunday-schools, 490—501.

Convocation Literature [*Works by Fraser, Wake, Atterbury, &c.*] 369—400. Present aspect of the Convocation question, its reform, 370. Old writers on Convocation, 371. Reign of William III., 372. The Non-Jurors, 373. Sir Bartholomew Shower, 375. Wake, 376. Hill, 378. Atterbury, 379, 380. White Kennet, 381. Hody, 383; and the subsequent controversy, 384—400.

E.

Etruria, Cities and Cemeteries of [*Dennis's Etruria, &c.*] 79—109. Interest of Tuscany, 79. Recent writers, Mrs. H. Gray,

Mr. Dennis, 80. Present state of the country,—Veii, 82. Vetulonia, 83. Sovana, 85. Tomb of Porsena, 87. Etruria and Rome, 89. Etrurian creed, polity, and history, 89—103. Egypt, 104. Etruscan works of art, 106, 107. Etrurian influences, 108, 109.

I.

India, the Church in [*Evidence before the House of Commons, &c.*], 45—78. Select Committee of 1852, 45. The Church in India, 46. Its origin, 47. The Church is for the Company's servants, 48. The Chaplains, 49. Relations with the Bishop, 50. The Church Erastian, 51, and Governmental, 52. The English Missions, 53—58. Evidence before the House of Commons, 58. The status of the Bishop, 59—63. St. Paul's cathedral, Calcutta, 64. Portuguese clergy, 65. State and prospects of the Indian Church, 66—78.

J.

Jews [*The Kings of the East, &c.*], 110—170. The future of the Jewish people, 110. Their conversion, 111, and probable restoration, 112, illustrated by Scripture, 113, 114. Their temporal prospects, 115—120. The opinions of the Fathers, 122—127; of great doctors, 128—134; of a tone of Christian and Jewish feeling at various times, 135—150. Opinions of distinguished authors, 151—170.

M M

NO. LXXXVI.—N.S.

L.

Liguori, S. Alfonso [*Theologia Moralis*, &c.], 401—447. Liguori's position in the Roman system, 401—404. Authorized moral codes, 405. Equivocation, 406. Theory of Theft, 407; illustrated by extracts, 408—446. Simplicity of a good moral code, 447.

London, Corporation of the City of [*Report of the Commissioners*, &c.], 220—257. History of the London Corporation, 220. Political importance of the city, 221—223. Growth of its privileges, 224. Aspect of the city (proper) to the whole metropolis, 225. Southwark, 226. The proposed Reform of the Corporation, 227. Obstructions from the City Officers, 228. What the Commission really proposed, 228. Defects and remedies, 229—257.

M.

Medieval Sermons [*Concionales*, &c.], 1—44. English Sermons, 1; of the last century, 2. Medieval arts of preaching, 3. Early extemporary sermons, 4. St. Augustine's, *ibid.* Bede's, 5. S. Hildebert's, 6, 7. Character of Middle-Age Sermons, 8—10. Mystical sense of Scripture, 11—17. Bishop Andrewes, 17. Anecdotes and illustrations, 18—44.

Milman's Latin Christianity [*History of Latin Christianity*, &c.], 265—326. Object of the work, 265. Its literary character, 266. Pictorial in execution, 267. Characteristics of the ages of which it treats, 268, 269. Ecclesiastical history in general, 270. Ideal of the Christian Church, 271. How far Church history is only the history of any stage of intellect, 272—277. Is there an absolute

Christianity? 277. Denied by Dr. Milman, 280—282. Sketch of his history, 283. Damascus, 284—287. The first four centuries, 288—290. The next sixty years, 290—294; down to Gregory I., 294—300. Mohammedanism, &c., 301—308. From A.D. 800 to A.D. 1044, 308—316. Paschal II., 316—318. History of Christianity, 319. Its lessons and offences, 320—326.

S.

Societies, Religious [*Clarke's Memoirs of the Wesleys*, &c.], 195—219. Samuel Wesley the Elder, 195. Religious Societies of his day, 196—201. Religious Conferences, 202—206. Stephens, 206. John Wesley, 208. Necessities of the age, 209. How far these Religious Societies are capable of a revival, 210—219.

Sherwood, Mrs. [*Life of Mrs. Sherwood*, &c.], 327—368. Biography, 327. Mrs. Sherwood, 328. Her childhood, 329. Parentage, 330—334. Sent to school, 334. Her religion, 335—337. She leaves school, 338. Her home life, 339—341. Her marriage, 342, 343. She sails for India, 344. Her life, 345—364. The closing scene, 365. General reflections, 366—368.

V.

Voltaire [*Bungener's Voltaire and his Times*], 171—194. French infidelity fashionable, 171. Voltaire its centre, 172. His history and life, 173—194.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JULY.—Bruton's Paper on Architecture—Meyrick's Excerpts from Cosin and others—*Florum Sacra*—*L'Ami de la Religion*—Waddington on the Greek Church—Bishop of Exeter's Pastoral Letter—Trench's Synonyms—Maurice's Ecclesiastical Lectures—West's Figures and Types of the Old Testament—Póor Paddy's Cabin—Vestiges of Divine Vengeance—*Quelques Mots par un Chrétien Orthodoxe*—Gosse's Aquarium—Points of War—Notanda—Susanna, and Ruth Osborne—The Old Black Oak—Caswall's Western World Revisited—Songs for the Church—Parker's Series of Oxford Classics—Stories on Proverbs—Consecration v. Desecration—Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania—Archbishop Whately's Remains of Bishop Copleston—A Month in India—Wray's Memoirs of Hughes—Hospitals and Sisterhoods—Sermons by Messrs. Warburton, Newland, Miller, Sowter, Kempe, Gowring, Beamish, &c.

OCTOBER.—Churton's Cleveland Psalter—Testimony of the Church to Holy Baptism—Hungarian Sketches—Juvenile Englishman's Library—The Deluge—Anderdon's Life of Bishop Ken—The Plain Commentary—Archbishop Whately's Charge—Bere's Sermons for a Sick Room—Scenery, Science, and Art—Funeral Sermon by Mr. Butler—Lee's Irish Bampton Lecture—Proceedings of a Meeting at Chichester—Miracles and Science—Stapleton's Three Broad Sheets—The Monthly Packet—The Violet's Close—Millner's Letter to Dale—Readings for the Aged—Bishop of Newfoundland's Second Voyage to Labrador—The Journal of Convocation—Sermons by Messrs. Lowe, Cochin, Courtenay, Seymour, Cunningham, and Baines.

713



